-ORTZ Legal Transcription of the Closed Session of the Michigan Independent Citizens
Redistricting Commission

Held on Wednesday, October 27, 2021 Commencing at 4:05 p.m. Transcribed by Carolyn Grittini, CSR-3381

> Fortz Legal Support www.FortzLegal.com 844.730.4066



Transcription of the Closed Session of the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission Held on Wednesday, October 27, 2021 Commencing at 4:05 p.m. Transcribed by Carolyn Grittini, CSR-3381 

Toll Free: 844.730.4066

```
1
       Wednesday, October 27, 2021
 2
       4:05 p.m.
 3
                         CHAIR SZETELA: As Chair of the commission, I
 4
 5
             call this closed session of the Michigan Independent
             Citizens Redistricting Commission to order at 4:05 p.m.
 6
 7
             For the public record, could the secretary please take the
 8
             roll? Could the secretary please take the roll?
 9
                         SECRETARY: Commissioners, please say present
10
             when I call your name. If you're attending today's
11
            meeting remotely, please disclose during roll call that
12
             you are attending remotely. You know the drill. Doug
13
             Clark.
14
                         COMMISSIONER CLARK: Present.
15
                         SECRETARY: Juanita Curry.
16
                         COMMISSIONER CURRY: Present and attending
17
             remotely from Detroit, Michigan.
18
                         SECRETARY: Anthony Eid.
19
                         COMMISSIONER EID: Present.
20
                         SECRETARY: Brittni Kellom.
21
                         COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Present.
22
                         SECRETARY: Rhonda Lange.
23
                         COMMISSIONER LANGE: Present, attending
24
             remotely from (inaudible).
25
                         SECRETARY: Steve Lett.
```

Toll Free: 844.730.4066

1	COMMISSIONER LETT: Present.
2	SECRETARY: Cynthia Orton.
3	COMMISSIONER ORTON: Present.
4	SECRETARY: M.C. Rothhorn.
5	COMMISSIONER ROTHHORN: Present.
6	SECRETARY: Rebecca Szetela.
7	COMMISSIONER Szetele: Present.
8	SECRETARY: Janice Vallette.
9	COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present.
10	SECRETARY: Erin Wagner. Erin, I'm going to
11	prompt you to unmute on your phone.
12	COMMISSIONER VALLETTE: Present, attending
13	remotely from Charlotte, Michigan.
14	SECRETARY: Richard Weiss.
15	COMMISSIONER WEISS: Present.
16	SECRETARY: Dustin Witjes.
17	COMMISSIONER WITJES: Present.
18	SECRETARY: All commissioners are present.
19	CHAIR SZETELA: Thank you, Ms. Reinhardt. We
20	have entered a closed session to discuss the
21	attorney-client memos that we received from our general
22	counsel and Mr. Adelson. Mr. Adelson, our general
23	counsel, who wants to lead the discussion?
24	MS. PASTULA: So I will start. Thank you,
25	Madam Chair. So I will start. Again, stating for the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

record and the closed session minutes that the closed session is called in accordance with Section 8H of the Open Meetings Act being MCL 15.268H. The session was called to occur on Wednesday, October 27th, upon adoption of the resolution and the closed session was called to order at 4:05 p.m. to discuss the privilege and confidential memos being Voting Rights Act of October 14th, 2021 and the history of discrimination in the state of Michigan and its influence on voting of October 26th, '21. These memos are both attorney-client privileged communications that provide legal advice to the client, prepared by counsel in regard to the Voting Rights Act and are therefore exempt from disclosure under Section 13G of the Michigan Freedom of Information Act being MCL 15.243, subpart 1, subsection G.

The rules for closed sessions are that the confidentiality of the closed session, none of the discussion topics or documents may be shared outside of this room. Everyone received the confidentiality agreement, that if you have not returned to either Sue Ann or myself, please do so. The rules, additionally, that the topic of the closed session can only be the Voting Rights Act based on the two memoranda that are the basis for this closed session. If the topic veers off of this course, I will provide a warning. If the conversation

does not cease immediately, the closed session will be halted and we will return to open session at that time. If you have any questions about either of these two things, I know this is our first closed session. So again, we're here to talk about the VRA. We're here to have an open conversation between the MICRC and its attorneys about the VRA, and with all that being said, I'll turn it over to Bruce.

MR. ADELSON: Thank you. And thank you for the opportunity to have this meeting. Julieann and I thought that it was important with the -- as a result of the memos, the information that's being discussed in the conventional media, on social media and everywhere to answer questions, provide some advice about a path forward and discuss what the Voting Rights Act actually requires. And let's start with that.

The Voting Rights Act, as you know from our discussions previously in the memo, does not require any numerical amount of majority-minority districts; indeed, does not even require majority-minority districts at all. The Voting Rights Act, as you know, is designed and intended to provide an opportunity or ability to elect on the part of protected categories under the statute. That's based on race, color and membership in a language minority group. There are no guarantees of success.

There is nothing in the VRA nor in the jurisprudence that requires the success of any particular candidate or that any particular candidate of choice be of a particular race. Typically, as has been seen in court decisions going back decades, a candidate of choice of a minority group is often a person of a minority. But that is neither required nor does it happen in every circumstance. All of that ties into what we've been stressing for a while.

This is a data law analysis election results driven process. We have become concerned that there is so much misinformation out there. We wanted to have an opportunity to set the record straight in a sense, provide our advice, provide you with information about what the law actually says and to encourage that as we move forward over the next eight days, if there are ongoing questions or uncertainties, please come to us, as many of you have, to ask questions to get some additional information.

But we thought it was really important to stress these threshold items. And as you know, too, where we are today. As you recall, on September 2nd, Dr. Handley presented her racial bloc voting analysis. Racial bloc voting analysis is required by the Supreme Court pursuant to the Voting Rights Act in order to determine if there is racial bloc or racially polarized voting. If there is,

Toll Free: 844.730.4066

what is the remedy for that. The remedy is also informed by Dr. Handley's conclusion of the VAP, the voting age population, that's required or that she has concluded.

Minorities need to elect a candidate of choice.

That's key. Because rather than just assigning numerical numbers and talking about a district. I read the other day that someone suggested, why don't they just create districts that are 55 to 58 percent black? What's the basis for that? Dr. Handley's analysis does not include that and we've never recommended that as an arbitrary percentage of minority voters is needed to comply with the Voting Rights Acts.

In addition, one of the differences this cycle, redistricting cycle, compared to ten years ago and something that Julieann and I talked about a while ago and we've been actively thinking about as the process has unfolded, the federal judiciary is more conservative than it was ten years ago. The judiciary, particularly the Supreme Court, on several occasions has indicated some reluctance to abide what they consider to be race-based solutions, race-based answers, race-based compliance. So that is yet another reason why just having arbitrary numbers, 60 percent, 58, you know, whatever they are, under the premise of the VRA, I think, has particularly fraught this cycle, and something that we have actively

Toll Free: 844.730.4066

1 thought about, been concerned about and that's yet another 2 reason why we stick to the data, the analysis, the election results. 3 4 I also wanted to comment briefly on the Voting Rights Act in primary elections. We've heard a lot about 5 that. Yes. 6 7 COMMISSIONER ROTHHORN: So I want to make sure 8 that we understand this data. The analysis and the 9 primary results --10 MR. ADELSON: Election results. 11 COMMISSIONER ROTHHORN: Right, election 12 results. (Inaudible). They didn't have Dr. Handley's 13 second set of data. MR. ADELSON: Well, the data's like what's in 14 15 the active matrix. The data includes, yes, Dr. Handley's 16 analysis. Yes. 17 COMMISSIONER ROTHHORN: And that the analysis 18 (Inaudible). Sorry about that. I forgot. So yeah, the 19 data is in the active matrix, the analysis is Dr. Handley's analysis primarily and the election results is 20 21 also in the active matrix, but it's the election results. 22 So those -- okay, thank you. Just wanted to be clear. 23 MR. ADELSON: Sure. And to your point, as you know, the matrix includes one primary results statewide 24 25 from 2018. The reality in Michigan is, there are no more

Toll Free: 844.730.4066

statewide primary results. I know there's been a lot of talk about primary results.

What's also important to remember, and I don't know that we've touched on this specifically, often in primaries there may be a multi-candidate field that, let's say, has seven minority candidates and one white candidate. I'm just saying that at random. Remember, one of the keys for Voting Rights Act is -- and the Thornburg versus Gingles Supreme Court case. Cohesiveness. Meaning the minorities have to vote essentially for the same candidate. If you have seven, six, five -- if you have multiple candidates, minority candidates, in a primary field, it would be very difficult, in my experience, for one to achieve 50 percent or more so that that person could be analyzed to be the candidate of choice.

That's one of the challenges with primary elections. Although, primary elections, I agree, when they're available, can be helpful. It's also important to realize in a multi-candidate field, the Voting Rights Act doesn't pick favorites in a sense. It's all about the voters. It's not about the candidates. So if the voters are showing that they are preferring multiple candidates, then the rhetorical question is well, who's the minority candidate of choice? It would be, in my experience, very difficult in a multi-candidate field to come to that

conclusion, so that while primaries can provide useful information, please be advised that they don't necessarily -- they're not necessarily dispositive. They don't necessarily tell the whole choice.

Remember, the Voting Rights Act does not require a guarantee that any particular person will be elected.

It's an opportunity to be elected and ability to elect.

That's what Dr. Handley's analysis is premised on. Her analysis of a percentage that's needed, threshold percentage, for minority voters to achieve that opportunity or ability to elect.

So, these have been among the larger concerns that we've had with either misinformation or no information.

And along the same line, I have to point out that all the studies -- I shouldn't use that word. Of all the information that's been put out there, there are no racial bloc voting analyses that we've seen that contradict or even address or even exist to counter what Dr. Handley did.

The information -- like for example, in the AFL-CIO, the Fair Maps Report. They mention that the Voting Rights Act requires if you have a certain number of majority-minority districts, you must have the same number. That is legally and factually incorrect. That's part of what we've been concerned about. These documents

are infused with either misinformation or lack of information.

The Michigan Civil Rights Commission document, one of the concerns that we have about that is it presupposes if a minority candidate, a black candidate, wins in a particularly packed district, like a 90 percent district, I think was one of the ones that was referenced, the report makes the assumption that there are Hispanic and Asian voters in these districts and, ipso facto, they supported the black candidates. That's just beyond the pale of being insupportable and incorrect. Drawing that conclusion is based on no analysis and is -- it's just woefully misleading.

So the information that's out there does not contradict what you have been doing, what you have relied upon, what the law talks about and sometimes goes the other way and provides incorrect information that's misleading or can engender opposition to something that is baseless, that has no legal support.

So we've talked about this for a while and the -- it just came to the point recently that we both concluded that we really need to just lay this out, make it really clear that these things are just not true.

To that point and one point about going forward. We have some thoughts with some suggestions about how to deal

Toll Free: 844.730.4066

Toll Free: 844.730.4066

with some of the issues that have come up recently. But one of the things we have to stress, emphasize, insist on, plead, beg and say please, please don't use phrases about adding black people, subtracting black people, adding white people, subtracting white people. We're going in a little bit of a different direction.

The reason that we -- one of the reasons we wanted to have this session is that in looking to the future, looking over the next eight days, we don't want to give people out there specific paths to challenge what you're doing. Remember one of the things we talked about initially is legally, race cannot predominate redistricting. It can be one factor of many. But when phrases like that are used, it just ostensibly rockets up to the top, gives people the ammunition that they're looking for. And to that end, there's a substantial record, obviously, the commission has put together.

But since you're in the last phase now, people are going to focus -- I'll borrow a phrase from some, I don't even know who said this -- focus like a laser beam on what happens now, from now until next Friday. So that even if comments were made previously, the focus will be on what you do, what the dialog, the conversation is now, much more than what happened before. That was true in Arizona.

The lawsuits were based on the changes that were made after the draft maps were approved. After the public hearings when we went into the final mapping stage. The lawsuits focused there. What happened before was preliminary, and I think that that's also part of what we wanted to stress.

These draft maps are preliminary, as you know.

They're trial balloons. They're not final. You can make decisions about how to deal with these maps up until your deadline.

So I think that there were a lot of useful comments. I want to highlight one particular area of comments. A lot of information, as you know, that has been brought out that can be evaluated for what decisions you want to make going forward. One of the comments that I want to focus on are narrative comments, some comments in Flint yesterday. And that the focus of most of the comments about keeping Flint whole or Flint together, if you listen to them, were not racial. They were about, we want to elect someone who lives in Flint.

Having lived in Flint and having voted in Flint, I understand the difference between City of Flint and Genesee County. Very different demographics, very different. So that description was not race based, it was essentially, keep our community together. Keep our

1 folks together, keep our neighborhoods together because we know what's best for us with all of the tragedies that 2 Flint has experienced. And I think that's one of ours, as 3 we've talked about, one of our suggestions for a path 4 5 forward; that rather than focus on race predominantly, which, of course, as you know, we strongly advise not to 6 7 do, take a lesson from Flint in a sense. The focus being keep us together, we want to elect one of our own, not of 8 9 any particular race, but out of concern that our needs as 10 a community will be best served by electing someone who 11 lives in our community. 12 So that's one of our takeaways from yesterday, 13 something we've talked about and I think that that can be a path forward in addressing, evaluating, debating and 14 15 discussing some of the comments that you've heard over the 16 last week or so. Yes. CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid. 17 18 COMMISSIONER EID: So, how do we do that 19 without packing the districts? 20 COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Can I? 21 CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Kellom. 22 COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I think what I hear 23 Bruce saying is the rhetoric and language that we use to So like what we're actually doing when we're 24 25 reunifying folks is, of course, we're putting certain

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

races together and we know that. But then what we say is that we're observing the fact that these areas are uniquely different. Like when we think about Detroit. And so we're not using the language that is going to question the maps when it gets to that point. So, I think if we go back and look at the cultural aspects in the neighborhood, whether it's Flint, Saginaw, you know, the places that are completely black, just saying it like that, will be -- the undertones will be accomplishing what folks want, but doing it in a way that still upholds our criterion and everything else, like our matrix and our data and all that other stuff. But that's what I -- how I understood him to say it and what I've been thinking about. But I don't know if that's what you were asking necessarily. CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton. MR. ADELSON: Before we move on, I want to

MR. ADELSON: Before we move on, I want to address Commissioner Kellom and Commissioner Eid. One of the things that has been missing is in the public comments is the public has been like quite insistent that these are Voting Rights Act violations. Let's take a step back. They're not Voting Rights Act violations. Why?

Dr. Handley has determined, through her analysis, the VAP that's needed to elect in these areas. And I take your point, I agree that packing districts the way they

are now would be problematic. And we're not talking about that because we're really not talking about, excuse me, the Voting Rights Act. In my discussion about Flint, you notice I didn't say the Voting Rights Act at all. I didn't mention race at all. The reality is that there are, not only in Flint, but there are, I'm confident in looking at some of the comments, communities that were split, neighborhoods that were split, historic neighborhoods, particularly in the black community, that have that same commonality as the comments from Flint; we want to keep our community whole.

This is not about complying with the Voting Rights Act. Because it's been our determination, based on the analysis, that you've met those thresholds. There may be one or two, I think, that we can evaluate. But this is more a keeping neighborhoods whole, keeping communities whole, listening to the public. That's not a Voting Rights Act issue, per se.

Yes, if you had a downtown Detroit district where the black VAP was 20 percent, yes, I think that would definitely be something that we would need to address. But that's not where we are.

So that's a very important divide. And some think that I know Julieann and I felt and do feel very strongly about, that these comments about violating the

Toll Free: 844.730.4066

Voting Rights Act and Section II and talking about various Supreme Court cases. Well, no. Because remember, what's out there, no one has said that these thresholds are incorrect.

They may like, you know, certain thresholds to be different or higher and they may question why they're being used, but no one has said well, our analysis shows that the VAP should be 48.9 percent. Nobody said that. And I think that that's among the many telling omissions out there.

So this is less a VRA issue. That's one of the reasons in putting out the memorandum to distinguish what does the Voting Rights Act require. Not majority-minority districts, not numerical percentages; ability and opportunity to elect. Period.

The Flint issue is communities, neighborhoods and our being able to elect someone, not based on VRA requirements, but who understands what it's like to live in the City of Flint compared to somebody who lives out in Genesee County.

CHAIR SZETELA: So I would add to that, one of the things I thought was most revealing for me was, you know, you hear all these statements that people have said and it worries me deeply. And so I looked at the Promote the Vote maps, and more specifically, I looked at their

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

statistics. And if you look at our maps, like our congressional districts, we have two that are within the range of what we were aiming for, so they're in the 40 percentile of BVAP. If you look at the Promote the Vote maps for their congressional, they have one district that's 43 percent and one that's 50. And then if you go to their senate map, it's the same thing. If you actually look at their senate map and look at the statistics and compare it to ours -- I'm looking at their senate map right now. 40 percent, 42 percent, 43 percent, 47 percent, 41 percent. So their numbers aren't any different than ours at all. And so it's like, how is your 40 percent different from our 40 percent? And my takeaway is that it isn't about the Voting Rights Act and that their maps are the same as ours when it comes to the percentages. So, it's more about the feel. MR. ADELSON: Yes, that's a great point, Madam

MR. ADELSON: Yes, that's a great point, Madam Chair because we were -- Julieann, we were just wondering, did they use like our BV analysis? You got to kind of wonder about that because they obviously don't have their own.

And that being said, you know, keep in mind that the VAP numbers, of course, these are estimates. They're not written in stone. There are, I think, neighborhood community of interest issues in the black community in

Detroit that can be addressed, just like comments that you heard about Hamtramck, for example.

But we view these more as neighborhood community concerns, because unlike your -- unlike the naysayers who are out there. They haven't come to the table with any analysis to back up what they're talking about. Even one reporter asked me, is there a magic number in the Voting Rights Act? Does it say a magic number that we have to have X number of majority-minority districts. And the reporter was shocked when I said no, it's not about magic or numbers. It's about what does the analysis show.

Now Dr. Handley, as you know, is doing additional analysis, and we're going to be speaking with her to get more of a feel when that will be done. But unlike all the organizations and the people who are speaking very loudly, what we're doing, what you're doing is you're basing your work on analysis. So that one important distinction, whether it's Flint or however many districts in Detroit you decide to adjust that way.

Because we're not saying that you need 50.1 percent to elect, and I want to make sure that we're clear on this, that that's not packing. Let me say that again. In Flint -- we'll use Flint. Let's say Flint is kept reasonably whole, let's say it's 54 percent. That's not packing because we're not creating a district with a

certain arbitrary percentage to stuff black people into this area, more than they need to elect.

What you're doing is something that's not Voting Rights Act.

FEMALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible).

MR. ADELSON: Yes. And that community, that neighborhood scent -- that's a very important consideration. And what's also important, too, with all of the comments in the last couple of weeks, the comments that have recommended a specific numerical number for districts, the vast majority of comments that I heard, it was 50.1 percent. Not 59. What does that tell you? That that's less a VRA issue and more of a --

MALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible).

MR. ADELSON: That and a community-based neighborhood type vibe that's not saying we have to have this. It's something different.

MS. PASTULA: It's based solely on race, those comments. And a lot of that advocacy efforts, and I know Cynthia's arm is going to fall off if it's up in the air anymore. But one thing I wanted to highlight, too, about Flint, and I stepped out of the room a couple times for meetings, but what I wanted to highlight is what I was hearing was water crisis, disinvestment, GM leaving, the school board issues. There were a few commenters that

talked about race or talked about the 50 percent plus one or you have to pack us in because the primary has too many people run. Although, I think that was a predominantly Detroit comment.

So again, what I was hearing wasn't VRA advocacy. What I was hearing was community of interest advocacy, founded on their lived experiences and their history and that's very different than running -- than doing that and running a BVAP number and using that in the analysis. That's not what they were suggesting. The majority of commenters. But I thought that was a fascinating thing as well. Did you talk about cohesion yet or not yet? Or we go to Cynthia first?

MR. ADELSON: Yes.

CHAIR SZETELA: Let Commissioner Orton go. She's worried she's going to forget her thoughts.

COMMISSIONER ORTON: So I did forget the first one. But, the next one is -- I was going to say when we're talking about this, if we choose to put anything together that we currently have separated, we go back to communities of interest. It's a community of interest thing, not a VRA thing.

MS. PASTULA: Just like when you were mapping, when you were mapping, you were talking about the public comments. You were talking about the people that

were giving testimony in the neighborhood. You had other sources of data that you were looking at. You had the active matrix. You had all of these sorts of things that inform your work and resulted in draft proposed maps.

I think it's critical. Again, they were draft proposed maps. I don't think anyone intended for a draft proposed map to make it through to the final maps without any at least discussion, I won't say modification, but at least a discussion about should anything be changed? What did we hear at the public hearings? How do we move forward on this map?

COMMISSIONER ORTON:: Well, I do also want to say I think, I hope we all recognize, at least I think many of the -- many, many, many of the comments that we heard, while they were saying that it was a VRA issue, it's a partisan issue. They have an agenda, and we need to be able to spot that and weed that out and not fall for that.

MR. ADELSON: And I think to that point, I think that's a really excellent way to look at it. I also have to say that the comments like that are in no way unique to this commission or Michigan. That there have and continue to be many situations around the country where minority voters are packed into a district to -- as a result of a working arrangement within the two major

political parties. That's been true for a long time. And I've seen that for a long time. And that has often resulted in packed districts.

And to your point, Commissioner, I think
that the being able to separate that out and realize
where these organized interests are coming from. I think
that's very important.

I want to make one quick comment. I know Commissioner Curry has her hand up.

CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, Commissioner Curry has her hand up.

MR. ADELSON: One of the -- under the Thornburg versus Gingles Supreme Court decision, in order to make a case for a Section II vote dilution requirement, you have to show that minority voters vote together; that they support the same candidate; that there's cohesion. In these multi-candidate fields, there really isn't cohesion because there's support for various candidates.

What's also interesting, in the 2018 primary election, remember El-Sayed, Thanedar and Whitmer. I spoke to Dr. Handley about that to see if that might shed some light on black voter behavior. She said what it does, it shows that there's no cohesion; that black voters supported in varying degrees all three candidates. So that means that that election is a valuable one. It has

1 been very useful in helping us kind of figure out 2 Arab-American preferences. But the only thing it tells us about black voter preferences is there's no cohesion; 3 that they support each candidate in varying numbers, not 4 5 necessarily reaching a majority. So that's really important, too, that with these 6 multi-candidate fields like this 2018 primary, if the 7 largest minority group is not supporting the same 8 9 candidate, they're not voting together cohesively, that's 10 one of the factors for Gingles. If you can't show that, 11 then you cannot prove Section II discrimination. 12 CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Curry. 13 COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yes. I want to comment that I'm tired of looking at this screen. Is there any 14 15 way possible -- I can feel more like I'm there with you 16 guys if I could see more faces, because all I'm looking at 17 is a screen. 18 CHAIR SZETELA: Hi, Juanita. 19 COMMISSIONER CURRY: I mean, it's strange 20 being out here trying to keep my concentration just 21 looking at Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission screen. 22 23 CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett or Sarah, 24 is there a way that she can fix that? Can she --

25

COMMISSIONER CURRY: Yeah, we usually do it

Toll Free: 844.730.4066

Toll Free: 844.730.4066

1 when we're at the -- when we're in sessions when I was 2 there. CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, you should be able to 3 go to the upper right corner and it should give you a 4 5 drop-down up at that -- there's like a little toggle and it'll say like change view and you can do like gallery, 6 7 side-by-side. I'm trying to do this from memory. Yeah. Speaker. Yeah, you want to do gallery probably or 8 9 speaker. 10 COMMISSIONER CURRY: I see everybody. 11 CHAIR SZETELA: Can you see that little -- in 12 the upper right-hand corner --13 COMMISSIONER CURRY: I got the upper, yeah, but it's still not giving me anything. In fact, now it's 14 15 all gone. 16 CHAIR SZETELA: No, you should have the 17 option for like speaker, side-by-side, gallery and you 18 probably want like gallery. 19 COMMISSIONER CURRY: Okay. It's just been 20 removed, so I'm going to leave it alone. 21 CHAIR SZETELA: Okay. 22 COMMISSIONER ROTHHORN: Sorry, Juanita. 23 CHAIR SZETELA: Sorry, Juanita. 24 COMMISSIONER CURRY: I'm going -- good night. 25 CHAIR SZETELA: Good night. Don't go yet.

1	COMMISSIONER ROTHHORN: Don't go yet. Don't
2	go yet.
3	COMMISSIONER CURRY: I can't see anything, so
4	why stay?
5	MALE SPEAKER: Because you can hear.
6	CHAIR SZETELA: Because you can hear us.
7	COMMISSIONER CURRY: No. You all need to fix
8	this thing right. I want to hear and see so I can have
9	some kind of
10	MS. REINHART: Juanita, unfortunately, we
11	can't fix it for you. You're going to have to change your
12	settings on your computer.
13	COMMISSIONER CURRY: I just did.
14	MS. REINHART: There should be an option on
15	there to change it to gallery view and then you'll be able
16	to see everyone.
17	COMMISSIONER CURRY: I had gallery and it only
18	showed myself bigger. Okay. I'm not seeing any faces. I
19	want that's okay. You all are not getting what I'm
20	trying to say.
21	CHAIR SZETELA: No, we know what you're
22	saying. I just don't know how to fix it for you.
23	COMMISSIONER CURRY: I think you would have to
24	do it there. I can't do it. I see my it's changed
25	somewhat, but Mike Brady is not showing. Rhonda Lange is

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

not showing. Erin Wagner is not showing. Then I still have a commission with a screen. That's better. Thank you. Somebody know how to do something. CHAIR SZETELA: All right. Commissioner Clark and then Commissioner Lett, sorry. COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. Bruce, I agree with everything you said about Flint. As I reflected back on that, when I was driving home last night. I agree. But Detroit's different. And so your comments were -- it appears to be a neighborhood issue and they want to have the neighborhoods consolidated. So we can do that and make minor modifications to the districts we've done. But that, to me, doesn't fix the problem they were complaining about. The problem they were complaining about was, in my mind, was that the districts didn't give them the opportunity to elect. And so changing just the neighborhoods is not going to change that problem. So the way to change that would be to make the

So the way to change that would be to make the districts -- compress them so that more of the blacks are in Detroit. But then you end up with the comment that Anthony was talking about, are we packing? So how do we resolve something like that?

CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner -- once you answer, then Commissioner Lett and then Commissioner Eid.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ADELSON: I think that's a great question and I think that the -- and you're right that a lot of the comments were, we can't elect. Of course, we don't agree with that. And you have analysis that supports our conclusion and our advice. They don't have that. So the level of VAP that is needed, I think Dr. Handley established that.

Now, I think that what's also true, whether it's the reunification of Hamtramck in one district, I can't tell offhand whether that -- how that changes from a population standpoint. But, in a sense, you know, I agree with you that we're not talking about vast changes. We're not suggesting vast changes to these districts. My recollection is that there are neighborhoods that were -whether they were -- I don't want to say split between counties, but that were split that just like the commission addressed the Lakeside districts and there have been a lot of comments about Ottawa County, Midland and a lot of other issues, too, that these are comments from the black community in Detroit, that if you look at the historic nature of Detroit which also -- the neighborhoods in Detroit, I think that our suggestion would be that that's something to evaluate and something to look at further.

And remember, too, that with the mantras, in a way,

Toll Free: 844.730.4066

in evaluating this. The Voting Rights Act is about opportunity or ability to elect candidates of choice, not candidates of a certain race and not guaranteeing that any one person or one race wins.

So that the process now, at the end, is a challenging one in the sense that you're filtering a lot more information than you were three weeks ago. A lot of that information is, at best, misleading. And to Commissioner Orton's point, a lot of it has a specific agenda where the people behind these agendas want a specific, relatively high black voting age population. We're not talking about that.

And I think that -- let's also be, you know, going back to what I had said before; that if you create districts or adjust districts so that they wind up having 50.1 percent, 51, 52 percent BVAP, we're not packing because that issue is not addressing a Voting Rights Act issue that your lawyers are advising you about.

Whether or not people in the community think it's a VRA issue is a different consideration. That bringing these, looking at these communities as the commission has been so responsive to, like with the Lakeside districts, I think that that's an important consideration.

What's also important, too, remember these last eight days. Are people going to look at this, this will

be the focus of litigation, the focus of testimony and the focus of depositions. It's really important, your attorneys believe, that you show now an additional effort to address the recent concerns without packing, without making population choices at random, but you show that we are addressing the concerns of the black community in Detroit. We're addressing the concerns of the black community in Flint. We're not doing it by creating 70 percent BVAP districts.

But we are looking at these, we're taking them seriously and you put on the record, show that you're doing that. Showing a court that this is what we did, that's what we did in Arizona, and there were a lot of concerns about oh, you know, you made this decision and that decision. As you know, we backed up every decision we made. We explained everything.

Being able to say, look at the changes that we made, look at the adjustments that were considered and approved that address these community-based neighborhood concerns, we think that's a very important place for the commission to be at this late stage because that kind of offsets significantly whatever comments, whatever issues came up previously, because it shows well, what did you do? What did you discuss? What decisions were made in the last eight days?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Toll Free: 844.730.4066

We see that as being a potentially tremendous benefit that takes away a potential avenue of litigation and gives you a substantial record to run on, in a sense, to show this is what we addressed, this is how we did it and we didn't do it by packing people. We didn't do it by just randomly coming up with numbers, and we didn't do it because we thought that there was vote dilution and discrimination of the Voting Rights Act. COMMISSIONER CLARK: So with our spoke concept in Detroit, do you think we're on the right track? MR. ADELSON: Well, I think that -- and that's

something that, you know -- I'm glad that you mentioned that because that's something that we really wanted to stress and that this is a good time to do that.

Michigan, and this is part of the reason -- well, let me back up for a minute. The memorandum on discrimination, history of discrimination, is important, because if this were a Section II case under the Voting Rights Act, the court would consider that. So we thought that it's important for the commission to know if there is any type of Voting Rights Act litigation, that's exactly what people are going to be looking at. That's what an expert will be hired to do. There will be a paper like So your being able to see now what may happen in the future is important to know.

1 And in referencing that, Michigan, as you know, has 2 been a state since 1837. Legislative maps, until now, were drawn either by courts or by the legislature, 3 whether it was in 1898 or 2000. So you talk about the 4 5 spoke system. You spent a lot of time and hard work unpacking the city that, frankly, has been packed for 6 7 decades, partly because of that arrangement we talked 8 about between the political parties. That took a lot of 9 work and we applaud that. We think that definitely is the 10 right track. It expands minority vote opportunities. 11 expands opportunities for the black community in Detroit 12 to expand its influence. So yes, that is definitely the 13 right way to go. We are not, in any way suggesting, nor will we, that you pull back and go south of Eight Mile and 14 15 stay there. We are not saying that at all. Your 16 unpacking work was significant. Never happened in the 17 almost 200-year history of this state. 18 And what you're doing -- and I want to --19 CHAIR SZETELA: We have three people who have 20 hands up. 21 MR. ADELSON: Oh, I'm sorry. 22 CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Lett, 23 Commissioner Eid and then Commissioner Lange. 24 Commissioner Lett, go ahead. 25 COMMISSIONER LETT: I agree with Bruce's

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

analysis for the primary reason that I've been listening to what he's been saying, obviously, and I've been listening to what the civil rights director, who is an attorney, has to say. And so I was somewhat concerned -what he's saying is that if you have a majority-minority district and you have to keep a majority-minority district and Bruce is saying no, you don't. Then, who is right and have -- Johnson is his name. Is it correct saying that you have to keep as many majority-minority districts as you started with under Section II, I said, well, why not I go and look in Section II and see what it has to say. So I've done that a couple times and I did it once today as we're locked down, providing ourselves with security -ha, ha, ha. There is nothing, I'll repeat that, there is nothing in the statute that talks about a percentage. There is nothing in the statute that talks about a majority-minority district or a minority-majority district. It's not even mentioned in the statute. So when he comes on in front of us and says that, as

So when he comes on in front of us and says that, as Julieann has stated, it's absolutely wrong. It's two paragraphs. I'd be happy to show it to you.

Secondly, Virginia, great state of Virginia tried this. They came out in a case -- the recent case. It's the -- give me the name. It's after Gingles. It's a very recent case and it says -- well, you have to have -- they

decided well, we have to have a majority-minority district, because I think they were under VRA and so they went 50.something. And the Supreme Court says no, you did that just because you were putting that 50+ percent race in to make that majority-minority district. You only did it because of race. That is against the case law. And that is where the VRA and Section II is analyzed is in the case law, not in the statute.

So the other thing is, the case law and the statute and the case law interpretation is, it's results oriented. It's not intent. So what that means is if we make a district -- I'll pick 55 percent as the number and we make a 55 percent district, that's pretty blatant on its face that the result that we've achieved is that it's a majority-minority district and it's assumed, presumed then that you did it because of race and then the burden shifts back to you, us, to prove we didn't do that.

Finally, in respect to Commissioner Eid's how are we supposed to protect ourselves, if you didn't read Edward's clip from 10/25/21 in which Mark Grebner was interviewed, you should. Number one, I like it because it's exactly what I believe. And he is the person -- I've known of him, he's not a personal friend, but he has been a political operative in Ingham County forever and he runs a political consulting firm. And if you want to know who

voted for whom, when, go ask him, he'll tell you. He says communities of interest was created as a nebulous criteria that the Redistricting Commission could use later as cover for whatever map it draws. Communities of interest is a will-o-the-wisp. It's a wreath of smoke. It can be whatever is necessary. The crucial thing is, who decides what a community of interest is that gets preserved? The answer, the commission does. Who gets to review that? Frankly, nobody does. It's up to them. Was it originally intended? Yes. It was built-in. It's nailing Jell-O to the wall.

Now, you can think that that's being rather over the top, but as a lot of people that have heard me talk, that's exactly what I believe. Who decides what a community of interest is? Doug asked that question right upfront, first meeting maybe, second meeting. Who defines community of interest, and my statement was, the community of interest defines if it's a community of interest. But that's what we can use now to justify what we're doing. And it's in the amendment. They put it in there for us. So let's use what we got.

And I know that M.C. really likes communities of interest.

CHAIR SZETELA: We know that.

COMMISSIONER LETT: He really likes them.

Toll Free: 844.730.4066

Toll Free: 844.730.4066

1 CHAIR SZETELA: He loves them. 2 COMMISSIONER LETT: So when we have a problem, M.C., look at your notes and tell us what the community of 3 interest is. 4 5 But I mean, that's how we're going to do it. Population, they got to be contiguous, and then do what's 6 7 best for the state. I agree with the people that out there said, do what's best for the state. And here's what 8 9 we have to do in order to do that. And here's how we have 10 to provide ourselves with cover. We can do it. Tomorrow. 11 CHAIR SZETELA: Tomorrow. So I have one 12 follow-up question and this is a yes or no 13 question/answer, please. Does the Michigan Department of Civil Rights typically enforce the Federal Voting 14 15 Rights Act? 16 MR. ADELSON: No. 17 CHAIR SZETELA: No, okay. And that was my --18 no disrespect to Mr. Johnson, but I'm like, why is the 19 Michigan Department of Civil Rights weighing in on the 20 Voting Rights Act? That's not their jurisdiction. That's 21 the Department of Justice. Okay. 22 CHAIR SZETELA: Political, yeah. 23 Commissioner Eid and then Commissioner Lange and then Commissioner Kellom. 24 COMMISSIONER EID: Well, I agree with 25

1 everything Steve just said. I mean, you can't really 2 argue with facts like that. I also reflected on the Detroit hearing and being someone who lives there, has 3 lived in the city for ten years, yeah, they were just 4 5 wrong. Like I hate to say it, but I mean, we have analysis. Fact-based analysis that shows that, you know, 6 7 their comments were not backed by anything other than their feelings, which are very warranted as they have had 8 9 a long history of oppression. But as far as the maps that 10 we drew, you know, I was very uncomfortable with them at 11 first. I said it in a public hearing that oh, you know, I 12 don't know about this. But, I went back to the analysis 13 and tried to poke holes in the analysis, I really did. But, I mean, I couldn't. It was a well-done analysis. I 14 15 wanted to ask our lawyers, do you think there's anything 16 in that analysis that could be called into question? 17 MS. PASTULA You mean Dr. Handley's 18 analysis? 19 COMMISSIONER EID: Yeah. 20 MS. PASTULA: I think we've always been 21 consistent. Even before the commission had Dr. Handley and Mr. Adelson, the commission has consistently said that 22 23 the data's going to drive the number of majority-minority 24 districts. Remember, we were getting a lot of pressure 25 very early on. How many are there? Is there going to be

Toll Free: 844.730.4066

1 Is there going to be more? Is there going to be 2 Is there going to be zero? And the answer always was, that until the data is taken and analyzed, that is 3 unknown. And so what the commission has is it has the 4 5 data, it has the analysis and it has the ability to make decisions based on that analysis. And I think the key --6 7 again, we've always been consistent not only with the 8 Section II stuff, but with the case law. What does the 9 case law say? The case law says the 50 plus one percent 10 is garbage. The case law says retrogression is garbage. 11 And you have advocacy people -- and I respect their 12 passion, I respect their lived experience, but what 13 they're doing is advocating for the commission not to follow the law. And it's our job, as unpopular as it is, 14 15 to try to keep you on track with the law and advise you as 16 best we can. So no, I think you have exactly the data you need to make the decisions, the difficult decisions that 17 18 the commission needs to make and I think you have a wealth 19 of other data to make other decisions on other criteria 20 that we're not talking about in this session that can 21 support those decisions as well. I think the commission 22 should feel secure in its data and what it has available 23 and that you have resources to discuss those with from 24 this point moving forward. But, we've always been 25 consistent and we will always be consistent in that

Toll Free: 844.730.4066

1 advice. CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Kellom. 2 Oh, Commissioner Lange. I'm so sorry. 3 4 COMMISSIONER LANGE: Pass. 5 CHAIR SZETELA: Pass, okay. Commissioner Kellom. 6 7 MR. ADELSON: Well, I just wanted to follow up 8 briefly on what my colleague said. I agree. And I'm 9 sorry, that's two words, I want to be as succinct as 10 possible as I know Commissioner Kellom has a comment, but 11 I agree with what Julieann --12 COMMISSIONER KELLOM: I don't know if it's 13 like a comment or -- well, yeah, it is a comment. getting a little uncomfortable because it sounds like 14 15 we're being empowered to not change what we've done, and I 16 think we would be doing a disservice. I've lived in 17 Detroit all my years and I understand, I saw the 18 politicians that got up and spoke and I knew who they were 19 and I know why they were saying that, but the undertone 20 that I know to be true is that in some areas, if we don't 21 change and if we are going to be acquiesce in our position 22 that, you know, we've done such a great job and analysis 23 says that, I think we're going to miss listening to the citizens in Detroit, and that really scares me. Because I 24 25 see a bunch of nodding heads. I see us almost taking on

the position of what politicians have done in saying oh, we did a good job and we're not going to change it. And there are certain people there -- we all know that candidate of choice means electing candidates that look like them. Like, let's be clear.

So on one hand, there are people there that want their friends to win, et cetera. But on the other hand, I can't ignore the people that are talking about how Southfield is ripped up, and that is true. How Palmer Park is ripped up, and that is true. And these are areas in which my mother and grandparents still live and that I frequent. So it's like, Anthony, I respect what you're saying, but the Detroit area is jacked up and we need to change it. And I don't want us to sit here and start thinking about ways that we can keep it the same.

MS. PASTULA: And I want to jump in really quick because we're not strategizing or planning or doing a course of action because we're in closed session, what we're doing is we're discussing information and we're covering, again, the substance of Bruce's analysis, and what we're doing is we're distinguishing how what a lot of what you have heard is not supported by the VRA, is not supported by the VRA analysis. And whether it can be addressed in other ways is a topic for the open session and your deliberation and adjustment work. But again,

it's that really, the substance of a lot of what you were told about the VRA is flat-out incorrect. It has always been incorrect, and that that really was -- particularly with some of the questions that we were getting, it was really important to have the VRA discussion collectively so that you'd benefit from hearing each other's questions and the fuller answers. But I just wanted to jump in on that. Again, because we are in closed session, so we're talking about the contents of the memo, what the VRA does say, what the VRA does not say and how everybody keeps missing the -- not everybody in this room, but how like the public, they're very passionate about what they want without accurately identifying what they want.

COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Correct. So what I'm saying is, although they might be using the wrong terminology, I don't want us to ignore what they're actually saying. So if we know what they're saying, then we need to fix it. We need to -- okay, yeah, you're using the wrong word -- like you do, you know, a kid or something, but we know that we can go back and change it. So if that's what -- as long as we're all on the same page. That's all I'm saying.

MR. ADELSON: And I think that to that point, I think that one of the most compelling reasons why we wanted to meet is to address what does the VRA require?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

What does it not require? And in moving forward over the next eight days, that there are, particularly in looking at the potential for litigation in the future, that this is your time to create a vibrant, compelling record that addresses many issues. As Julieann said, we're not having a strategy conversation, but these are things that it's important to distinguish. This is the time to focus on creating that record, understanding what the VRA says and doesn't say, understanding --CHAIR SZETELA: I see you, Commissioner

Curry.

MR. ADELSON: Understanding how all these interrelationships, how they come together. as I said, that the point we also wanted to make about Flint. Most of the comments didn't even address the VRA. They talked about the community, communities of interest and issues that are not VRA issues. That doesn't mean that they don't have their own compelling rationales which is separate from where we are today. But that meeting spoke loudly about many issues. Most of them were not about the Voting Rights Act, and that's an important distinction, as well as creating that record going forward, that will be examined closely in litigation.

Yeah, I want to mention one more point that we wanted to really stress, and this is --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER ORTON: Could we get Commissioner Curry first?

CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Curry, go ahead. COMMISSIONER CURRY: Thank you. Sorry, Bruce, I lose my train of thought pretty fast, so let me get this I just wanted to say that when it comes to Detroit, the people that spoke out for Detroit, they use different terms as somebody just said. They may say different things, but the issue is still as important as the water issue, all other issues around the state, those issues are important because people died, people bled, people got hungry for it, people work and strive just as hard as the people that had to change the way they drink water. And I'm all for people that had to -- what happened in Flint. I mean, yeah, in Flint. But the same issue, different issues are just as important to people when they come out to tell you -- Detroit just stuck to the -- what is that? The BA -- the BRA codes or whatever. But it's the same issue, and so we need to fix it up some, because just as we fix up one place, we've got to fix up -- we've got to try and fix up everybody that has those deep concerns, because this is why we're hired. This is why we're here. And the thing about the VRAs, we got to stick to this or stick to that, I got you, Steve, you told -- that was excellent the way you brought that out. And even

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Toll Free: 844.730.4066

Julieann. But we've got to look out for Detroit. in Detroit, so definitely, I'm going to speak up. we've got to give the people some of what they want, because their issues is just as important as Flint's issue and I love Flint, too. I know a lot of people in Flint. I know the issues they had. The lady that did the commercials for the water thing, I kinda grew up with her. So I know the issues. But our issues here in Detroit, they come from the heart. They come from sweat. come from work, hard work. And sometimes, hungriness. Sometimes people had to suffer for it. So let's deal with it, too. MS. PASTULA: So I'm going to give you guys your first warning. Your first warning. We're getting -we're Q and A'ing on VRA, Q and A'ing on the memos, Q and A'ing on those types of things. And I appreciate the fact, again, that how things grow out and how the conversation grows out, that's a natural thing. So it's certainly expected, but we've got to pull -- are there any other specific questions on the VRA or the memos? If not, Bruce had one additional point. But again, we have to be focused on --COMMISSIONER CURRY: We are focused, Julieann. I'm focused. I know exactly --MS. PASTULA: No, I appreciate that,

Commissioner Curry. I certainly apologize for interrupting you, but again, it's not -- we can't do the strategizing session, and I'm sure a lot of your colleagues have their thoughts as well.

COMMISSIONER CURRY: I'm not talking about strategizing as much as being real.

MS. PASTULA: Thank you, Commissioner

Curry. Commissioner Lett and then Commissioner Orton, did

you have a comment or you were just -- okay.

COMMISSIONER LETT: Just two things to follow up with Commissioner Kellom. We can change. Nobody in this room is saying we can't go in and make changes. The only thing that we are saying is, when we make those changes, we need to be cognizant of the VRA and how we're going to do that.

COMMISSIONER KELLOM: Just making sure.

COMMISSIONER LETT: And we're going to do

it -- I'm assuming we're going to do it in Detroit. We're

going to do it in Flint. We're going to do it in Grand

Rapids, Ottawa, you name it. Second point, forget about

litigation when we get into these maps. Don't sit there

and think well, I got to make this change, but am I going

to get sued? You're going to get sued, so forget it.

You're going to get sued, so forget that. Let's just do

the best job we can with the advice that we're getting.

1	MALE SPEAKER: Okay, thank you.
2	MS. PASTULA: Again, the purpose of the
3	closed session was, what is the VRA, what is not the VRA.
4	And you guys are on you guys were on the right track
5	and you're staying on the right track. You have the
6	advice, you have the data, you have all the tools you need
7	and you have the resources that you can tap into. Again,
8	I would strongly advise you to listen to your lawyers, not
9	other people's lawyers.
10	COMMISSIONER ORTON: And I just want to say,
11	remember the wording. This can all fall under communities
12	of interest.
13	FEMALE SPEAKER: Right.
14	MALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible).
15	COMMISSIONER CURRY: Absolutely.
16	CHAIR SZETELA: M.C.
17	COMMISSIONER ROTHHORN: So two thoughts in my
18	mind. One, we were in open session, we did talk about
19	voting or voter turnout and do we need data for voter
20	turnout at all. And the second question was related to
21	should I not say anything about that?
22	CHAIR SZETELA: Yeah, we can't that's
23	MS. PASTULA: We can address those in open
24	session.
25	COMMISSIONER ROTHHORN: I wasn't sure if it

was related to VRA. The second question is also, is it related. We've asked for Lisa to give us additional analysis. Is it related to VRA? And is there any reason to think that we need to wait for that analysis or something like that. Do I even remember correctly?

MR. ADELSON: As you know, and as I mentioned earlier, Dr. Handley is doing additional analysis. We will get an update as quickly as possible. That's something that will be discussed in open session. It is a Voting Rights Act related -- it's related analysis. And as she continues to perform her analysis, we'll have a greater understanding of where she is and when she will be -- when the analysis will be completed. That is a VRA analysis.

I wanted to -- in closing, I wanted to mention one issue that's connected with both memos, particularly -- well, not particularly. It's connected to both memos. The Voting Rights Act, as I had said earlier, as you know, was passed in 1965 in response to the march in Selma, the march to Montgomery, Alabama, the injuries that occurred that day, the violence was on national television, got a lot of attention and really was seen as a galvanizing moment in American history. This law is about, as I said earlier, the opportunity and ability to elect, regardless of race, color or membership in a language minority group.

That's enshrined in the Voting Rights Act. It's also enshrined in the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution which is related to the Voting Rights Act.

And the last point I wanted to make, along with the opportunity and ability to elect, and in looking at the next eight days and, frankly, your legacy certainly from my standpoint; you have the opportunity to create more opportunities than have been created in the 200 years of Michigan history. More opportunities to elect, abilities to elect. And again, no guarantees, no requirement that a certain person of a certain race must be guaranteed success. That's not what the Voting Rights Act says.

But in thinking about the memos, as I was writing both of them, one of the issues that came up to me was legacy. Because we really are at the legacy stage in a sense that, to me, being able to say and do that, to create the opportunities and abilities to elect that the Voting Rights Act was intended for, speaks to, is significant. And we don't always get to do that, but that's something that I wanted to convey and that's based on my work enforcing the VRA for the United States and also the work that I've done since then. That's an incredibly powerful opportunity. That's what the Voting Rights Act says. That's our opinion. That's our advice and that will be our advice going forward. Thank you.

CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Eid and then Commissioner Orton.

COMMISSIONER EID: Just one more quick thing, kind of a different topic. We also heard comments from Dearborn as it regards to VRA and Arab-Americans. I think we've done a pretty good data-driven process looking at that, but do you guys have anything more for us in that regard?

MR. ADELSON: Well, that's also a great point that I want to address and I think, Commissioner, you had asked us a while ago and I saw a couple of misstatements about this in the public sphere. The Voting Rights Act does protect Arab-Americans. The Voting Rights Act protects people based on race, color, national origin.

As you know, there was -- the United States sued the City of Hamtramck about 20 years ago for discrimination against Arab-Americans. The United States and the consent decree signed by a federal judge claimed -- not claimed, stated that there were violations of the Voting Rights Act against Arab-Americans based on race and color.

So to be clear, the Voting Rights Act does apply to Arab-Americans. They are a protected category under the statute. I did see a couple comments over the last couple of days, I think there was one from Flint actually, or maybe while we were in Flint, that said to the contrary.

1	That is incorrect. The Arab-Americans are protected under
2	the Voting Rights Act.
3	CHAIR SZETELA: Commissioner Orton.
4	COMMISSIONER ORTON: So I just have a comment.
5	I just wanted to remind us all that so we need to do
6	this work. It was set up so that we hear from citizens,
7	but I think at this point, we need to kind of shut out all
8	of the criticisms that are coming and all the pressure,
9	because these are all motivated, and we need to do our
10	work using the VRA and communities of interest.
11	MS. REINHART: And I would just like to
12	remind everybody that we are running out of daylight.
13	CHAIR SZETELA: Go ahead, Commissioner Clark.
14	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah. And to add on to
15	what Cynthia just mentioned
16	MS. PASTULA: Is it directly related to the
17	VRA?
18	COMMISSIONER CLARK: No. Anything discussed
19	in this room today should stay in this room. Period.
20	MS. PASTULA: This is a confidential
21	discussion.
22	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Not discussed with
23	anybody.
24	MS. PASTULA: This is a confidential
25	discussion. Again, as we started, if you have your

1	Confidentiality Agreements, you can return them to Sue Ann
2	or myself. It is a confidential discussion unless the
3	court orders it open, that's why we have the recording.
4	That's why we have the basis and we'll move forward.
5	COMMISSIONER LETT: I move we adjourn the
6	closed session and go back into open session.
7	COMMISSIONER WITJES: Second. Sorry, second.
8	CHAIR SZETELA: Motion by Commissioner Lett,
9	seconded by Commissioner Witjes to conclude the closed
10	session.
11	MS. REINHRT: Before the vote, Madam Chair,
12	I just want to indicate to everyone joining remotely.
13	What this means, after the vote to adjourn if it passes,
14	you will leave this Zoom meeting and re-join the Zoom
15	webinar. So the meeting that we were on right before
16	this. You can use the same link and you will be able to
17	join that one again. Thank you.
18	CHAIR: All right. All in favor of adjourning
19	the closed session, raise your hand and say aye.
20	MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Aye.
21	CHAIR: All opposed, raise your hand and say
22	nay. I can't see them.
23	COMMISSIONER ROTHHORN: Juanita raised her
24	hand. I didn't hear from Erin and Rhonda.
25	CHAIR SZETELA: Erin and Rhonda, could you

## Case 1:22-cv-00272-PLM-RMK-JTN ECF No. 126-1, PageID.4619 Filed 12/11/23 Page 53 of 73

MICHIGAN INDEPENDENT CITIZENS REDISTRICTING COMMISSION TRANSCRIPTION, AUDIO 10/27/2021

Job 27452 52

Toll Free: 844.730.4066

1	verbally indicate your vote?
2	COMMISSIONER LANGE: Aye.
3	COMMISSIONER WAGNER: Aye.
4	CHAIR SZETELA: All right. The ayes prevail.
5	It's unanimous, the closed session is adjourned at
6	5:19.
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Toll Free: 844.730.4066

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY  STATE OF MICHIGAN )  ) SS  COUNTY OF MACOMB )		
STATE OF MICHIGAN ) ) SS		
) SS		
, and the second		
COUNTY OF MACOMB )		
I, CAROLYN GRITTINI, certify that this recording was		
transcribed by me on the date hereinbefore set forth; that the		
foregoing recording was recorded by me stenographically and		
reduced to computer transcription; that this is a true, full and		
correct transcript of my stenographic notes so taken; and that I		
am not related to, nor of counsel to, either party nor		
interested in the event of this cause.		
Carolyn Grittini		
<u>Cawyn Guana</u>		
CAROLYN GRITTINI, CSR-3381		
Notary Public,		
Macomb County, Michigan.		
My Commission expires: July 15, 2029		

1	<b>50+</b> 34:4	40:8,15 41:2,9,12 42:14,16,2 21 43:23 45:5,20 46:18,21
	<b>50.1</b> 19:20 20:12 29:16	47:23 48:13 49:12,16
<b>1</b> 4:15	50.something 34:3	absolutely 33:20 46:15
<b>10/25/21</b> 34:20	<b>51</b> 29:16	accomplishing 15:9
<b>13G</b> 4:13	<b>52</b> 29:16	accordance 4:2
<b>14th</b> 4:8 48:2	<b>54</b> 19:24	accurately 41:13
<b>15.243</b> 4:14	<b>55</b> 7:8 34:12,13	<b>achieve</b> 9:14 10:10
<b>15.268H</b> 4:3	<b>58</b> 7:8,23	achieved 34:14
<b>1837</b> 32:2	<b>59</b> 20:12	acquiesce 39:21
<b>1898</b> 32:4	<b>5:19</b> 52:6	<b>Act</b> 4:3,7,12,14,23 5:15,17,2
<b>1965</b> 47:19	6	6:24 8:5 9:8,19 10:5,22 15:2 22 16:3,4,13,18 17:1,13 18:1
2		19:8 20:4 29:1,17 31:8,19,21 36:15,20 42:21 47:10,18 48:
	<b>60</b> 7:23	3,12,18,24 49:12,13,19,21
<b>20</b> 16:20 49:16	7	50:2
<b>200</b> 48:8		action 40:18
<b>200-year</b> 32:17	<b>70</b> 30:8	<b>active</b> 8:15,19,21 22:3
<b>2000</b> 32:4	8	actively 7:16,25
<b>2018</b> 8:25 23:19 24:7		<b>Acts</b> 7:12
<b>2021</b> 2:1 4:8	<b>8H</b> 4:2	<b>actually</b> 5:15 6:15 14:24 18: 41:17 49:24
<b>21</b> 4:10		41:17 49:24 add 17:21 50:14
<b>26th</b> 4:9	9	
<b>27</b> 2:1	<b>90</b> 11:6	adding 12:4 addition 7:13
<b>27th</b> 4:4		
<b>2nd</b> 6:21	A	<b>additional</b> 6:18 19:12 30:3 44:21 47:2,7
4	<b>A'ING</b> 44:15,16	additionally 4:21
40, 40,0 40 40	abide 7:20	<b>address</b> 10:18 15:18 16:21 30:4,19 41:25 42:15 46:23
<b>40</b> 18:3,10,13	abilities 48:9,17	49:10
<b>41</b> 18:11	<b>ability</b> 5:22 10:7,11 17:14 29:2	addressed 19:1 28:17 31:4
<b>42</b> 18:10	38:5 47:24 48:5	40:24
<b>43</b> 18:6,10	<b>able</b> 17:17 22:17 23:5 25:3 26:15 30:17 31:24 48:16 51:16	addresses 42:5
<b>47</b> 18:10	<b>about</b> 5:3,5,7,14 6:14 7:6,15,	<b>addressing</b> 14:14 29:17 30:
<b>48.9</b> 17:8	16 8:1,5,18 9:2,20,21 10:25	Adelson 3:22 5:9 8:10,14,23
<b>4:05</b> 2:2,6 4:6	11:4,16,20,24,25 12:3,11 13:9, 18,19 14:4,13 15:3,14 16:2,3,	15:17 18:17 20:6,15 21:14
5	12,25 17:1 18:14,16,20 19:2,6,	22:19 23:12 28:1 31:11 32:21
	10,11 20:22 21:1,12,19,24,25 22:9 23:21 24:3 27:7,14,21	36:16 37:22 39:7 41:23 42:12 47:6 49:9
<b>50</b> 9:14 18:6 21:1 38:9	28:12,18 29:1,12,18 30:14 32:4,8 33:15,16 37:12 38:20	adjourn 51:5,13

adjourned 52:5	always 37:20 38:2,7,24,25	areas 15:2,24 39:20 40:10
adjourning 51:18	41:2 48:19	<b>aren't</b> 18:11
adjust 19:19 29:15	<b>am</b> 45:22	argue 37:2
adjustment 40:25	amendment 35:20 48:2	<b>Arizona</b> 12:24 30:13
adjustments 30:18	American 47:23	<b>arm</b> 20:20
adoption 4:4	ammunition 12:15	around 22:23 43:10
advice 4:11 5:14 6:14 28:5	<b>among</b> 10:12 17:9	arrangement 22:25 32:7
39:1 45:25 46:6 48:24,25	amount 5:19	Asian 11:9
advise 14:6 38:15 46:8	analyses 10:17	ask 6:18 35:1 37:15
advised 10:2	<b>analysis</b> 6:10,22,23 7:9 8:2,8, 16,17,19,20 10:8,9 11:12	<b>asked</b> 19:7 35:15 47:2 49:11
advising 29:18	15:23 16:14 17:7 18:19 19:6,	asking 15:14
advocacy 20:19 21:5,6 38:11	11,13,17 21:10 28:4 33:1 37:6, 12,13,14,16,18 38:5,6 39:22	aspects 15:6
advocating 38:13	40:20,23 47:3,4,7,10,11,13,14	assigning 7:5
<b>AFL-CIO</b> 10:20	analyzed 9:15 34:7 38:3	assumed 34:15
after 13:2 33:24 51:13	<b>Ann</b> 4:20 51:1	assuming 45:18
again 3:25 5:5 19:22 21:5 22:5	another 7:22 8:1	assumption 11:8
38:7 40:20,25 41:8 44:17,21 45:2 46:2,7 48:10 50:25 51:17	<b>answer</b> 5:14 27:24 35:8 38:2	attending 2:10,12,16,23 3:12
against 34:6 49:17,20	answers 7:21 41:7	attention 47:22
age 7:2 29:11	<b>Anthony</b> 2:18 27:21 40:12	attorney 33:4
agenda 22:16 29:10	<b>any</b> 5:3,18 6:2,3 10:6 14:9	attorney-client 3:21 4:10
agendas 29:10	18:11 19:5 22:8 24:14 26:18 29:3 31:21 32:13 44:19 47:3	attorneys 5:7 30:3
<b>ago</b> 7:14,15,18 29:7 49:11,16	anybody 50:23	available 9:18 38:22
<b>agree</b> 9:17 15:25 27:6,8 28:3,	anymore 20:21	avenue 31:2
11 32:25 36:7,25 39:8,11	anyone 22:6	<b>away</b> 31:2
agreement 4:20	anything 21:20 22:9 25:14	<b>aye</b> 51:19,20 52:2,3
Agreements 51:1	26:3 37:7,15 46:21 49:7 50:18	ayes 52:4
ahead 32:24 43:3 50:13	apologize 45:1	
aiming 18:3	appears 27:10	В
<b>air</b> 20:21	applaud 32:9	<b>BA</b> 43:18
Alabama 47:20	<b>apply</b> 49:21	back 6:5 15:6,21 19:6 21:21
almost 32:17 39:25	appreciate 44:16,25	27:7 29:14 31:16 32:14 34:17
<b>alone</b> 25:20	approved 13:2 30:18	37:12 41:20 51:6
along 10:14 48:4	Arab-american 24:2	<b>backed</b> 30:15 37:7
<b>also</b> 7:1 8:4,21 9:3,18 13:5	<b>Arab-americans</b> 49:5,13,17, 20,22 50:1	balloons 13:8
20:8 22:12,20 23:19 28:8,21 29:13,24 37:2 42:13,14 47:1		<b>based</b> 4:23 5:24 11:12 13:1,2 16:13 17:17 20:18 38:6 48:20
48:1,22 49:4,9	arbitrary 7:10,22 20:1	49:14,20
although 9:17 21:3 41:15	area 13:12 20:2 40:13	baseless 11:19

**basing** 19:17

basis 4:23 7:9 51:4

**beam** 12:20

because 7:5 14:1 16:2,13 17:2 18:18,20 19:4,20,25 21:2 23:18 24:16 26:5,6 29:17 30:21,23 31:7,13,18 32:7 34:2, 4,6,16,21 39:14,24 40:17,18 41:8 43:11,19,22 44:4 48:15 50:9

become 6:11

been 6:4,8 7:16 8:1 9:1 10:12, 16,25 11:15 13:13 15:13,19,20 16:13 23:1 24:1 25:19 28:18 29:22 32:2,6 33:1,2 34:23 37:20 38:7,24 41:3 48:8

before 12:24 13:4 15:17 29:14 37:21 51:11,15

**beg** 12:3

behavior 23:22

**behind** 29:10

being 4:3,7,14 5:7,12 11:11 14:7 17:7,17 18:22 23:5 24:20 30:17 31:1,24 35:12 37:3 39:15 45:6 48:16

believe 30:3 34:22 35:14

benefit 31:2 41:6

best 14:2,10 29:8 36:7,8 38:16

45:25

better 27:2

between 5:6 13:22 28:15 32:8

beyond 11:10

**bigger** 26:18

**bit** 12:6

**black** 7:8 11:5,10 12:4 15:8 16:9,20 18:25 20:1 23:22,23 24:3 28:20 29:11 30:6,7 32:11

**blacks** 27:19 blatant 34:13

**bled** 43:11

**bloc** 6:22,25 10:17

board 20:25

**borrow** 12:19

**both** 4:10 11:21 47:16,17

48:14

**BRA** 43:18

**Brady** 26:25

**briefly** 8:4 39:8

bringing 29:20

Brittni 2:20

brought 13:13 43:25

Bruce 5:8 14:23 27:6 33:7 43:4 44:21

Bruce's 32:25 40:20

**built-in** 35:10

bunch 39:25

**burden** 34:16

**BV** 18:19

BVAP 18:4 21:9 29:16 30:9

C

call 2:5,10,11

called 4:2,4,5 37:16

came 11:21 30:22 33:23 48:14

can 4:22 9:18 10:1 11:18 12:13 13:8,14 14:13,20 16:15 19:1 24:15,24 25:6,11 26:5,6,8 27:11 35:5,12,19 36:10 38:16, 20 40:15,23 41:20 45:11,25 46:7,11,23 51:1,16

can't 24:10 26:3,11,24 28:3,9 37:1 40:8 45:2,12 46:22 51:22

**candidate** 6:2,3,5 7:4 9:7,11, 15,24 11:5 23:16 24:4,9 40:4

**candidates** 9:6,12,21,22 11:10 23:18,24 29:2,3 40:4

cannot 12:12 24:11

case 9:9 23:14 31:18 33:23.25 34:6,8,9,10 38:8,9,10

**cases** 17:2

categories 5:23

category 49:22

cease 5:1

certain 10:22 14:25 17:5 20:1 29:3 40:3 48:11

certainly 44:19 45:1 48:6

cetera 40:7

Chair 2:4 3:19,25 14:17,21 15:16 17:21 18:18 21:15 23:10 24:12,18,23 25:3,11,16,21,23, 25 26:6,21 27:4,23 32:19,22 35:24 36:1,11,17,22 39:2,5 42:10 43:3 46:16,22 49:1 50:3, 13 51:8,11,18,21,25 52:4

challenge 12:10

challenges 9:16

challenging 29:6

**change** 25:6 26:11,15 27:17, 18 39:15,21 40:2,14 41:20 43:13 45:11,22

changed 22:9 26:24

changes 13:1 28:10,12,13 30:17 45:12,14

changing 27:16

Charlotte 3:13

**choice** 6:3.5 7:4 9:15.24 10:4 29:2 40:4

choices 30:5

**choose** 21:19

circumstance 6:7

citizens 2:6 24:21 39:24 50:6

city 13:22 17:19 32:6 37:4 49:16

civil 11:3 33:3 36:14,19

claimed 49:18

Clark 2:13,14 27:5,6 31:9 50:13,14,18,22

clear 8:22 11:23 19:21 40:5 49:21

client 4:11

**clip** 34:20

**closed** 2:5 3:20 4:1,5,16,17, 22,24 5:1,4 40:18 41:8 46:3

Toll Free: 844.730.4066

51:6,9,19 52:5

closely 42:23	commonality 16:10	conservative 7:17
closing 47:15	communications 4:11	<b>consider</b> 7:20 31:19
<b>codes</b> 43:18	<b>communities</b> 16:7,16 17:16	consideration 20:8 29:20,23
cognizant 45:14	21:21 29:21 35:2,4,22 42:16	considered 30:18
<b>cohesion</b> 21:12 23:16,17,23	46:11 50:10	<b>consistent</b> 37:21 38:7,25
24:3	<b>community</b> 13:25 14:10,11 16:9,11 18:25 19:3 20:6 21:6,	consistently 37:22
cohesively 24:9	21 28:20 29:19 30:6,8 32:11	consolidated 27:11
Cohesiveness 9:9	35:7,15,17,18 36:3 42:16	Constitution 48:2
colleague 39:8	community-based 20:15 30:19	consulting 34:25
colleagues 45:4	compare 18:9	contents 41:9
collectively 41:5	compared 7:14 17:19	
<b>color</b> 5:24 47:25 49:14,20	compelling 41:24 42:4,18	contiguous 36:6
<b>come</b> 6:17 9:25 12:1 19:5	. •	continue 22:23
42:13 43:16 44:9,10	complaining 27:13,14	continues 47:11
<b>comes</b> 18:15 33:19 43:6	completed 47:13	<b>contradict</b> 10:17 11:15
coming 23:6 31:6 50:8	completely 15:8	contrary 49:25
<b>comment</b> 8:4 21:4 23:8 24:13	compliance 7:21	conventional 5:13
27:20 39:10,13 45:9 50:4	comply 7:11	<b>conversation</b> 4:25 5:6 12:23 42:6 44:18
<b>commenters</b> 20:25 21:11	complying 16:12	convey 48:20
<b>comments</b> 12:22 13:11,12, 15,16,17 14:15 15:19 16:7,10,	compress 27:19	corner 25:4,12
25 19:1 20:9,11,19 21:25	computer 26:12	
22:14,21 27:9 28:3,18,19 30:22 37:7 42:15 49:4,23	concentration 24:20	correct 33:8 41:14
commercials 44:7	concept 31:9	correctly 47:5
	concern 14:9	<b>could</b> 2:7,8 9:15 24:16 35:3 37:16 43:1 51:25
<b>commission</b> 2:4,6 11:3 12:17 22:22 24:22 27:2 28:17 29:21	concerned 6:11 8:1 10:25	couldn't 37:14
30:20 31:20 35:3,8 37:21,22	33:4	counsel 3:22,23 4:12
38:4,13,18,21	<b>concerns</b> 10:12 11:4 19:4 30:4,6,7,14,19 43:21	counter 10:18
<b>Commissioner</b> 2:14,16,19, 21,23 3:1,3,5,7,9,12,15,17 8:7,	conclude 51:9	counties 28:16
11,17 14:17,18,20,21,22	concluded 7:3 11:21	country 22:23
15:16,18 21:15,17 22:12 23:4, 9,10 24:12,13,19,23,25 25:10,	<b>conclusion</b> 7:2 10:1 11:12	County 13:23 17:20 28:18
13,19,22,24 26:1,3,7,13,17,23 27:4,5,6,23,24 29:9 31:9	28:5	34:24
32:22,23,24,25 34:18 35:25	confident 16:6	<b>couple</b> 20:9,22 33:12 49:11,
36:2,23,24,25 37:19 39:2,3,4, 5,10,12 41:14 42:10 43:1,3,4	confidential 4:7 50:20,24 51:2	-
44:23 45:1,5,7,8,10,11,16,17	confidentiality 4:17,19 51:1	<b>course</b> 4:25 14:6,25 18:23 28:3 40:18
46:10,15,17,25 49:1,2,3,10 50:3,4,13,14,18,22 51:5,7,8,9,	•	court 6:4,23 7:19 9:9 17:2
23 52:2,3	congressional 18:2,5	23:13 30:12 31:19 34:3 51:3
commissioners 2:9 3:18	<b>connected</b> 47:16,17	courts 32:3

consent 49:17

**cover** 35:4 36:10 **covering** 40:20

create 7:7 29:14 42:4 48:7,17

created 35:2 48:8

creating 19:25 30:8 42:8,22

crisis 20:24

criteria 35:2 38:19

criterion 15:11

critical 22:5

criticisms 50:8

crucial 35:6

cultural 15:6

currently 21:20

**Curry** 2:15,16 23:9,10 24:12, 13,19,25 25:10,13,19,24 26:3, 7,13,17,23 42:11 43:2,3,4 44:23 45:1,5,8 46:15

cycle 7:13,14,25

Cynthia 3:2 21:13 50:15

Cynthia's 20:20

## D

**data** 6:10 8:2,8,13,15,19 15:12 22:2 38:3,5,16,19,22 46:6,19

data's 8:14 37:23

data-driven 49:6

day 7:7 47:21

daylight 50:12

days 6:16 12:9 29:25 30:25

42:2 48:6 49:24

deadline 13:10

deal 11:25 13:9 44:11

Dearborn 49:5

debating 14:14

decades 6:5 32:7

**decide** 19:19

decided 34:1

**decides** 35:6,14

decision 23:13 30:14,15

**decisions** 6:4 13:9,14 30:24

38:6,17,19,21

**decree** 49:18

deep 43:21

deeply 17:24

defines 35:17,18

definitely 16:21 32:9,12 44:2

degrees 23:24

deliberation 40:25

demographics 13:23

**Department** 36:13,19,21

depositions 30:2

description 13:24

designed 5:21

determination 16:13

determine 6:24

determined 15:23

**Detroit** 2:17 15:3 16:19 19:1, 19 21:4 27:20 28:20,21,22 30:7 31:10 32:11 37:3 39:17, 24 40:13 43:6,7,17 44:1,2,8

45:18

Detroit's 27:9

dialog 12:23

**did** 10:19 18:19 21:12,17 22:10 26:13 30:12,13,23,24 31:4 33:12 34:3,5,16 37:13

40:2 44:6 45:8 46:18 49:23 **didn't** 8:12 16:4,5 27:15 31:5, 6 34:17,19 42:15 51:24

died 43:11

difference 13:22

differences 7:13

**different** 12:6 13:23,24 15:3 17:6 18:12,13 20:17 21:8 27:9 29:20 43:7,8,15 49:4

difficult 9:13,25 38:17

dilution 23:14 31:7

direction 12:6

directly 50:16

director 33:3

disclose 2:11

disclosure 4:13

discrimination 4:8 24:11

31:8,17 49:16

**discuss** 3:20 4:6 5:15 30:24

38:23

**discussed** 5:12 47:9 50:18,22

discussing 14:15 40:19

**discussion** 3:23 4:18 16:3 22:8,9 41:5 50:21,25 51:2

discussions 5:18

disinvestment 20:24

dispositive 10:3

disrespect 36:18

disservice 39:16

distinction 19:18 42:22

distinguish 17:12 42:7

distinguishing 40:21

**district** 7:6 11:6 16:19 18:5 19:25 22:24 28:9 33:6,17,18

34:2,5,12,13,15

**districts** 5:19,20 7:8 10:23 11:9 14:19 15:25 17:14 18:2 19:9,18 20:11 23:3 27:12,15, 19 28:13,17 29:15,22 30:9 33:9 37:24

divide 16:23

document 11:3

documents 4:18 10:25

**does** 5:1,18,20 6:7 7:9 10:5 11:14 17:13 19:8,11 20:12 23:22 35:8,9 36:13 38:8 41:9, 10,25 42:1 49:13,21

doesn't 9:19 27:13 42:9,17

**doing** 11:15 12:11 14:24 15:10 19:12,16 20:3 21:8 30:8, 12 32:18 35:20 38:13 39:16 40:17,19,21 47:7

**don't** 7:7 9:3 10:2,3 12:3,9,19 15:14 18:20 22:6 25:25 26:1, 22 28:3,5,15 33:7 37:12 39:12,

Toll Free: 844.730.4066

20 40:14 41:16 42:18 45:21 El-sayed 23:20 examined 42:23 48:19 **elect** 5:22 7:4 10:7,11 13:20 **example** 10:20 19:2 **done** 19:14 27:12 33:12 39:15, 14:8 15:24 17:15,17 19:21 excellent 22:20 43:25 22 40:1 48:22 49:6 20:2 27:16 28:3 29:2 47:24 48:5,9,10,17 excuse 16:2 Doug 2:12 35:15 elected 10:6,7 **exempt** 4:13 down 33:13 **electing** 14:10 40:4 exist 10:18 downtown 16:19 election 6:10 8:3,10,11,20,21 expand 32:12 **Dr** 6:21 7:2,9 8:12,15,19 10:8, 23:20.25 18 15:23 19:12 23:21 28:6 **expands** 32:10,11 **elections** 8:5 9:16,17 37:17,21 47:7 expected 44:19 **draft** 13:2,7 22:4,5,6 **else** 15:11 **experience** 9:13,24 38:12 Drawing 11:11 emphasize 12:2 experienced 14:3 drawn 32:3 empowered 39:15 experiences 21:7 draws 35:4 encourage 6:15 **expert** 31:23 drew 37:10 end 12:16 27:20 29:5 explained 30:16 enforce 36:14 drill 2:12 drink 43:13 enforcing 48:21 F drive 37:23 engender 11:18 face 34:13 driven 6:10 enshrined 48:1,2 faces 24:16 26:18 entered 3:20 driving 27:8 fact 15:2 25:14 44:17 drop-down 25:5 Erin 3:10 27:1 51:24,25 Fact-based 37:6 essentially 9:10 13:25 during 2:11 **facto** 11:9 Dustin 3:16 established 28:7 **factor** 12:13 estimates 18:23 factors 24:10 Ε et 40:7 facts 37:2 evaluate 16:15 28:23 each 24:4 41:6 factually 10:24 evaluated 13:14 earlier 47:7,18,24 Fair 10:21 evaluating 14:14 29:1 early 37:25 fall 20:20 22:17 46:11 even 5:20 10:18 12:20,21 19:6 Edward's 34:20 far 37:9 33:18 37:21 42:15 43:25 47:5 effort 30:3 fascinating 21:12 every 6:7 30:15 efforts 20:19 fast 43:5 everybody 25:10 41:10,11 **Eid** 2:18,19 14:17,18 15:18 43:21 50:12 favor 51:18 27:25 32:23 36:23,25 37:19 **everyone** 4:19 26:16 51:12 49:1,3 favorites 9:20 everything 15:11 27:7 30:16 **Eid's** 34:18 federal 7:17 36:14 49:18 37:1 eight 6:16 12:9 29:25 30:25 feel 16:24 18:16 19:14 24:15 everywhere 5:13

either 4:20 5:3 10:13 11:1

32:14 42:2 48:6

32:3

exactly 31:21 34:22 35:14

38:16 44:24

38:22

felt 16:24

feelings 37:8

Toll Free: 844.730.4066

**FEMALE** 20:5 46:13 friends 40:7 49:6 few 20:25 **from** 2:17,24 3:13,21 4:13 5:17 8:25 12:19,21 14:7,12 field 9:5,13,19,25 16:10 18:13 23:6 25:7 28:10. fields 23:17 24:7 19 34:20 38:23 41:6 42:19 44:9,10 48:6 49:4,24 50:6 figure 24:1

51:24 filtering 29:6 front 33:19 final 13:3,8 22:7 fuller 41:7 **Finally** 34:18 further 28:24 firm 34:25

future 12:8 31:25 42:3 first 5:4 21:13,18 35:16 37:11

five 9:11

43:2 44:14

**fix** 24:24 26:7.11.22 27:13 41:18 43:19,20,21

flat-out 41:2

**Flint** 13:16,18,20,21,22 14:3,7 15:7 16:3,6,10 17:16,19 19:18, 23 20:22 27:7 30:8 42:15 43:14,15 44:5 45:19 49:24,25

Flint's 44:4

focus 12:19,20,22 13:15,17 14:5,7 30:1,2 42:7

focused 13:4 44:22,23,24

folks 14:1.25 15:10

follow 38:14 39:7 45:10

follow-up 36:12

forever 34:24

forget 21:16,17 45:20,23,24

forgot 8:18

forward 5:14 6:15 11:24 13:15 14:5,14 22:11 38:24 42:1,23 48:25 51:4

founded 21:7

frankly 32:6 35:9 48:6

fraught 7:25 Freedom 4:14 frequent 40:12 Friday 12:21

friend 34:23

G

gallery 25:6,8,17,18 26:15,17

galvanizing 47:22

garbage 38:10 general 3:21,22

Genesee 13:23 17:20

gets 15:5 35:7,8

getting 26:19 37:24 39:14 41:4 44:14 45:25

**Gingles** 9:9 23:13 24:10 33:24

give 12:9 25:4 27:15 33:24 44:3,13 47:2

gives 12:15 31:3

giving 22:1 25:14

**glad** 31:12 **GM** 20:24

**go** 15:6 18:6 21:13,15,20 25:4, 25 26:1,2 32:13,14,24 33:11 35:1 41:20 43:3 45:12 50:13 51:6

goes 11:16

going 3:10 6:5 11:24 12:5,19 13:15 15:4 19:13 20:20 21:16, 18 25:20,24 26:11 27:17 29:13,25 31:22 36:5 37:23,25 38:1,2 39:21,23 40:2 42:22 44:2,13 45:15,17,18,19,22,23, 24 48:25

**gone** 25:15

good 25:24,25 31:14 40:2

**got** 18:19 25:13 35:21 36:6 39:18 43:11,20,23,24 44:1,3, 19 45:22 47:21

**Grand** 45:19

grandparents 40:11

great 18:17 28:1 33:22 39:22 49:9

greater 47:12 Grebner 34:20

grew 44:7

group 5:25 6:6 24:8 47:25

grow 44:17 grows 44:18 guarantee 10:6 guaranteed 48:11

guaranteeing 29:3 guarantees 5:25 48:10

guys 24:16 44:13 46:4 49:7

Н

**ha** 33:14

**had** 10:13 16:19 22:1,2,3 26:17 29:14 37:8,21 43:13,14 44:6,11,21 47:18 49:10

halted 5:2

Hamtramck 19:2 28:9 49:16

**hand** 23:9,11 40:6,7 51:19,21,

Handley 6:21 10:18 15:23 19:12 23:21 28:6 37:21 47:7

Handley's 7:2,9 8:12,15,20 10:8 37:17

hands 32:20

happen 6:7 31:24

happened 12:24 13:4 32:16 43:14

happens 12:21

happy 33:21

TRANSCRIPTION, AUDIO 10/27/2021 hard 32:5 43:12 44:10 Hispanic 11:8 historic 16:8 28:21 **has** 6:4 7:3,16,19,24 9:6 11:19 12:17 13:13 14:3 15:19,20,23 **history** 4:8 21:7 31:17 32:17 17:3,7 21:2 23:2,9,10,25 29:9, 37:9 47:23 48:9 21 32:1,6 33:4,11,20 34:23 holes 37:13 37:3,22 38:4,5,22 39:10 41:2 43:21 home 27:8 hate 37:5 hope 22:13 **have** 3:20 4:20 5:3,6,10 6:11, **how** 11:25 13:9 14:18 15:12 12,17 7:25 8:12 9:10,11 10:12, 18:12 22:10 26:22 27:3.21 14,22,23 11:4,15,25 12:1,2,8 28:10 31:4 34:18 36:5,9 37:25 16:10 17:23 18:2,5,20 19:8,9 40:8,9,21 41:10,11 42:12,13 20:10,16 21:2,20 22:16,21,22 44:17 45:14 23:14 25:16 26:8,11,23 27:2, 10 28:4,5,17 32:19 33:5,6,8,9, however 19:18 25 34:1 35:13 36:2,9,11 37:5,8 hungriness 44:10 38:11,16,18,23 40:1,22 41:5 42:18 44:21 45:4,9 46:5,6,7 **hungry** 43:12 47:11 48:7,8 49:7 50:4,25 51:3,4 ı haven't 19:5 **I'D** 33:21 having 7:22 13:21 29:15 42:5 he'll 35:1 he's 33:2,5 34:23 heads 39:25

I'LL 5:8 12:19 33:14 34:12

**I'M** 3:10 9:7 16:6 18:9 24:14, 15,16 25:7,20,24 26:18,19 31:12 32:21 36:18 39:3,8,13 41:14,22 43:14 44:2,13,24 45:3,5,18

**I'VE** 15:13 23:2 33:1,2,12 34:22 39:16 48:22

identifying 41:13

ignore 40:8 41:16

**II** 17:1 23:14 24:11 31:18 33:10,11 34:7 38:8

immediately 5:1

**important** 5:11 6:19 9:3,18 16:23 19:17 20:7,8 23:7 24:6 29:23,24 30:2,20 31:17,20,25 41:5 42:7,21 43:9,11,16 44:4

inaudible 2:24 8:12,18 20:5, 14 46:14

include 7:9

includes 8:15,24

incorrect 10:24 11:11,17 17:4 41:2,3 50:1

incredibly 48:23

indeed 5:19

Independent 2:5 24:21

indicate 51:12 52:1

indicated 7:19

influence 4:9 32:12

inform 22:4

information 4:14 5:12 6:14. 18 10:2,13,16,20 11:2,14,17 13:13 29:7,8 40:19

informed 7:1

infused 11:1

**Ingham** 34:24

initially 12:12

injuries 47:20

insist 12:2

insistent 15:20

insupportable 11:11

intended 5:22 22:6 35:10 48:18

**intent** 34:11

interest 18:25 21:6,21,22 35:2,4,7,15,17,18,19,23 36:4 42:16 46:12 50:10

interesting 23:19

interests 23:6

interpretation 34:10

interrelationships 42:13

interrupting 45:2

interviewed 34:21

**ipso** 11:9

isn't 18:14 23:17

**issue** 16:18 17:11,16 20:13 22:15,16 27:10 29:17,18,20 43:9,10,15,19 44:4 47:16

**issues** 12:1 18:25 20:25 28:19 30:22 42:5,17,20 43:10,16 44:4,6,8 48:14

it'll 25:6

**it's** 8:21 9:18,20,21 10:7 11:12 15:7 16:13 17:18 18:7,12,16

Toll Free: 844.730.4066

hired 31:23 43:22

highlight 13:12 20:21,23

hear 14:22 17:23 22:10 26:5,6,

**heard** 8:5 14:15 19:2 20:11

hearing 20:24 21:5,6 37:3,11

here 5:5 24:20 40:14 43:22

22:15 35:13 40:22 49:4

hearings 13:3 22:10

**heart** 44:9

helpful 9:18

helping 24:1

here's 36:8,9

44:8

Hi 24:18

high 29:11

higher 17:6

8 50:6 51:24

19:10,11,18,24 20:17,18,20 21:21 22:5,16 24:19 25:14,19 26:24 28:8 29:19 30:2 31:20 33:18,20,23,24 34:10,11,14, 15,22 35:5,9,10,18,20 38:14 39:12 40:12 41:1 42:6 43:18 44:18 45:2 47:10,17 48:1 52:5

items 6:20

J

jacked 40:13

Janice 3:8

**Jell-o** 35:10

**job** 38:14 39:22 40:2 45:25

**Johnson** 33:8 36:18

join 51:17

**joining** 51:12

**Juanita** 2:15 24:18 25:22,23 26:10 51:23

judge 49:18

judiciary 7:17,18

**Julieann** 5:10 7:15 16:24 18:18 33:20 39:11 42:5 44:1, 23

jump 40:16 41:7

jurisdiction 36:20

jurisprudence 6:1

just 7:5,7,22 8:22 9:7 11:10, 12,21,22,23 12:14 15:8 18:18 19:1 21:23 24:20 25:19 26:13, 22 27:16 28:16 31:6 34:4 37:1, 4 39:7 41:7 43:6,8,12,16,17,19 44:4 45:9,10,16,24 46:10 49:3 50:4,5,11,15 51:12

Justice 36:21

justify 14:24 35:19

Κ

**keep** 13:25 14:1,8 16:11 18:22 24:20 33:6,9 38:15 40:15

keeping 13:18 16:16

keeps 41:10

**Kellom** 2:20,21 14:20,21,22 15:18 36:24 39:2,6,10,12 41:14 45:11,16

kept 19:23

key 7:5 38:6

keys 9:8

kid 41:19

**kind** 18:19 24:1 26:9 30:21 49:4 50:7

kinda 44:7

knew 39:18

know 2:12 5:4,17,21 6:20 7:23 8:24 9:1,3 12:20 13:7,13 14:2, 6 15:1,7,14 16:24 17:5,23 18:22 19:12 20:20 23:8 26:21, 22 27:3 28:11 29:13 30:14,15 31:12,20,25 32:1 34:25 35:22, 24 37:6,10,11,12 39:10,12,19, 20,22 40:3 41:17,19,20 44:5,6, 8,24 47:6,18 49:15

known 34:23

L

lack 11:1

lady 44:6

Lakeside 28:17 29:22

**Lange** 2:22,23 26:25 32:23 36:23 39:3,4 52:2

language 5:24 14:23 15:4 47:25

larger 10:12

largest 24:8

laser 12:20

**last** 12:18 14:16 20:9 27:8 29:24 30:24 48:4 49:23

late 30:21

later 35:3

**law** 6:10,15 11:16 34:6,8,9,10 38:8,9,10,14,15 47:23

lawsuits 13:1,4

lawyers 29:18 37:15 46:8,9

lay 11:22

lead 3:23

least 22:8,9,13

leave 25:20 51:14

leaving 20:24

legacy 48:6,15

legal 4:11 11:19

legally 10:24 12:12

Legislative 32:2

legislature 32:3

less 17:11 20:13

lesson 14:7

let 19:22 21:15 31:16 43:5

**let's** 5:16 9:5 15:21 19:23,24 29:13 35:21 40:5 44:11 45:24

**Lett** 2:25 3:1 24:23 27:5,24 32:22,24,25 35:25 36:2 45:8, 10,17 51:5,8

level 28:6

light 23:22

like 8:14 10:20 11:6 12:14,20 14:24 15:3,9,11,20 17:5,18 18:1,12,19 19:1 21:23 22:21 24:7,15 25:5,6,17,18 27:22 28:16 29:22 31:23 34:21 36:18 37:2,5 39:13,14 40:5,12 41:11, 19 47:5 50:11

likes 35:22,25

line 10:14

link 51:16

Lisa 47:2

listen 13:18 46:8

**listening** 16:17 33:1,3 39:23

**litigation** 30:1 31:2,21 42:3,23

45:21

little 12:6 25:5,11 39:14

live 17:18 40:11 44:1

lived 13:21 21:7 37:4 38:12

39:16

lives 13:20 14:11 17:19 37:3

Toll Free: 844.730.4066

locked 33:13

long 23:1,2 37:9 41:21

**look** 15:6 18:1,4,8 22:20 28:20,23 29:25 30:17,18 33:11 36:3 40:4 44:1

looked 17:24,25

**looking** 12:8,9,16 16:7 18:9 22:2 24:14,16,21 29:21 30:10 31:22 42:2 48:5 49:6

lose 43:5

**lot** 8:5 9:1 13:11,13 20:19 28:2,18,19 29:6,7,9 30:13 32:5,8 35:13 37:24 40:21 41:1 44:5 45:3 47:22

loudly 19:16 42:20

love 44:5 loves 36:1

## М

M.C. 3:4 35:22 36:3 46:16

Madam 3:25 18:17 51:11

**made** 12:22 13:2 30:14,16,17,

24

magic 19:7,8,10

major 22:25

majority 20:11 21:11 24:5

**majority-minority** 5:19,20 10:23 17:13 19:9 33:5,6,9,17 34:1,5,15 37:23

**make** 8:7 11:22 13:8,14 19:21 22:7 23:8,13 27:12,18 34:5,11, 12 38:5,17,18,19 42:14 45:12, 13,22 48:4

**makes** 11:8

making 30:5 45:16

**MALE** 20:14 26:5 46:1,14

**mantras** 28:25

**many** 6:17 12:13 17:9 19:18 21:2 22:14,23 33:9 37:25 42:5, 20

**map** 18:7,8,9 22:7,11 35:4

mapping 13:3 21:24

**maps** 10:21 13:2,7,9 15:5 17:25 18:1,5,15 22:4,6,7 32:2 37:9 45:21

march 47:19,20

Mark 34:20

**matrix** 8:15,19,21,24 15:11 22:3

**may** 4:18 9:5 16:14 17:5,6 31:24 43:8

maybe 35:16 49:25

MCL 4:3,14

**mean** 24:19 36:5 37:1,5,14,17 42:17 43:15

Meaning 9:9

means 23:25 34:11 40:4 51:13

**media** 5:13

meet 41:25

**meeting** 2:11 5:10 35:16 42:19 51:14,15

meetings 4:3 20:23

membership 5:24 47:25

memo 5:18 41:9

memoranda 4:23

memorandum 17:12 31:16

memory 25:7

**memos** 3:21 4:7,10 5:12 44:15,20 47:16,17 48:13

mention 10:21 16:5 42:24 47:15

**mentioned** 31:12 33:18 47:6 50:15

met 16:14

**Michigan** 2:5,17 3:13 4:9,14 8:25 11:3 22:22 24:21 31:15 32:1 36:13,19 48:9

MICRC 5:6

Midland 28:18

might 23:21 41:15

Mike 26:25

Mile 32:14

mind 18:22 27:15 46:18

minor 27:12

minorities 7:4 9:10

**minority** 5:25 6:5,6 7:11 9:6, 12,23 10:10 11:5 22:24 23:15 24:8 32:10 47:25

minority-majority 33:17

minute 31:16 minutes 4:1

misinformation 6:12 10:13

misleading 11:13,18 29:8

miss 39:23

missing 15:19 41:11

misstatements 49:11

modification 22:8

modifications 27:12

moment 47:23

Montgomery 47:20

**more** 7:17 8:25 9:14 12:24 16:16 17:25 18:16 19:3,14 20:2,13 24:15,16 27:19 29:7 38:1 42:24 48:7,9 49:3,7

**most** 13:17 17:22 41:24 42:15,

**mother** 40:11

Motion 51:8

motivated 50:9

move 6:15 15:17 22:10 51:4,5

moving 38:24 42:1

**Mr** 3:22 5:9 8:10,14,23 15:17 18:17 20:6,15 21:14 22:19 23:12 28:1 31:11 32:21 36:16, 18 37:22 39:7 41:23 42:12 47:6 49:9

**Ms** 3:19,24 20:18 21:23 26:10, 14 37:17,20 40:16 44:13,25 45:7 46:2,23 50:11,16,20,24 51:11

much 6:11 12:23 45:6

multi-candidate 9:5,19,25 23:17 24:7

multiple 9:12,22 51:20

must 10:23 48:11

my 9:13,24 16:3 18:13 24:20 26:24 27:14 28:13 35:17 36:17 39:8,17 40:11 43:5 46:17 48:7,

myself 4:21 26:18 51:2

N

nailing 35:10

name 2:10 33:8,24 45:20

narrative 13:16

national 47:21 49:14

natural 44:18

**nature** 28:21

nay 51:22

naysayers 19:4

nebulous 35:2

necessarily 10:2,3,4 15:15 24:5

necessary 35:6

need 7:4 11:22 16:21 19:20 20:2 22:16 26:7 38:17 40:13 41:18 43:19 45:14 46:6,19 47:4 50:5,7,9

needed 7:11 10:9 15:24 28:6

needs 14:9 38:18

neighborhood 15:7 18:24 19:3 20:7,16 22:1 27:10 30:19

neighborhoods 14:1 16:8,9, 16 17:16 27:11,17 28:14,21

neither 6:7

never 7:10 32:16

next 6:16 12:9,21 21:18 42:2 48:6

night 25:24,25 27:8

**no** 5:25 8:25 10:13,16 11:12, 19 17:2.3.7 19:10 22:21 23:23 24:3 25:16 26:7,21 33:7 34:3

36:12,16,17,18 38:16 44:25 48:10 50:18

nobody 17:8 35:9 45:11

nodding 39:25

none 4:17

nor 6:1,7 32:13

notes 36:3

**nothing** 6:1 33:14,15,16

notice 16:4

number 10:22,24 19:7,8,9 20:10 21:9 34:12,21 37:23

**numbers** 7:6,23 18:11,23 19:11 24:4 31:6

numerical 5:19 7:5 17:14 20:10

0

observing 15:2

obviously 12:17 18:20 33:2

occasions 7:19

occur 4:4

occurred 47:20

October 2:1 4:4,7,9

off 4:24 20:20

offhand 28:10

offsets 30:21

often 6:6 9:4 23:2

oh 30:14 32:21 37:11 39:3 40:1

**okay** 8:22 25:19,21 26:18,19 27:6 36:17,21 39:5 41:18 45:9 46:1

omissions 17:9

once 27:23 33:12

one 7:13 8:24 9:6,7,14,16 11:3,7,24 12:2,7,11,13 13:12, 15 14:3,4,8,12 15:18 16:15 17:3,7,11,21 18:5,6 19:6,17 20:21 21:1,18 23:8,12,25 24:10 28:9 29:4.6 34:21 36:11 38:2,9 40:6 41:24 42:24 43:20 44:21 46:18 47:15 48:14 49:3. 24 51:17

ones 11:7

ongoing 6:16

only 4:22 16:6 24:2 26:17 34:5 38:7 45:13

**open** 4:3 5:2,6 40:24 46:18,23 47:9 51:3.6

operative 34:24

opinion 48:24

opportunities 32:10,11 48:8, 9,17

**opportunity** 5:10,22 6:13 10:7,11 17:15 27:16 29:2

47:24 48:5,7,23

opposed 51:21

opposition 11:18

oppression 37:9

option 25:17 26:14

order 2:6 4:6 6:24 23:13 36:9

orders 51:3

organizations 19:15

organized 23:6 oriented 34:10

origin 49:14

originally 35:9

**Orton** 3:2.3 15:16 21:15.17 22:12 43:1 45:8 46:10 49:2 50:3,4

Orton's 29:9

ostensibly 12:14

other 7:6 11:17 15:12 22:1 28:19 34:9 37:7 38:19 40:7,24 43:10 44:20 46:9

other's 41:6

Ottawa 28:18 45:20

ours 14:3 18:9,12,15

ourselves 33:13 34:19 36:10

outside 4:18

**over** 5:8 6:16 12:9 14:15 35:12

42:1 49:23	<b>per</b> 16:18	potentially 31:1
vn 14:8 18:21 42:18 	percent 7:8,23 9:14 11:6	powerful 48:23
	16:20 17:8 18:6,10,11,13 19:20,24 20:12 21:1 29:16	predominantly 14:5 21:3
	30:9 34:4,12,13 38:9	predominate 12:12
<b>p.m.</b> 2:2,6 4:6	percentage 7:11 10:9,10 20:1	preferences 24:2,3
pack 21:2	33:15	preferring 9:22
packed 11:6 22:24 23:3 32:6	percentages 17:14 18:16	preliminary 13:5,7
packing 14:19 15:25 19:22,25	percentile 18:4	premise 7:24
27:21 29:16 30:4 31:5	perform 47:11	premised 10:8
page 41:22	<b>Period</b> 17:15 50:19	prepared 4:12
pale 11:11	<b>person</b> 6:6 9:14 10:6 29:4 34:22 48:11	present 2:9,14,16,19,21,23
Palmer 40:9	personal 34:23	3:1,3,5,7,9,12,15,17,18
<b>paper</b> 31:23	phase 12:18	presented 6:22
paragraphs 33:21	phone 3:11	preserved 35:7
Park 40:10	phrase 12:19	pressure 37:24 50:8
part 5:23 10:25 13:5 31:15	phrases 12:3,14	presumed 34:15
particular 6:2,3 10:6 13:12	pick 9:20 34:12	presupposes 11:4
14:9	•	<b>pretty</b> 34:13 43:5 49:6
<b>particularly</b> 7:18,24 11:6 16:9 41:3 42:2 47:16,17	place 30:20 43:20	prevail 52:4
parties 23:1 32:8	places 15:8	previously 5:18 12:22 30:2
partisan 22:16	planning 40:17	<b>primaries</b> 9:5 10:1
partly 32:7	plead 12:3	primarily 8:20
Pass 39:4,5	<b>please</b> 2:7,8,9,11 4:21 6:17 10:2 12:3 36:13	primary 8:5,9,24 9:1,2,12,1
	plus 21:1 38:9	17 21:2 23:19 24:7 33:1
passed 47:19	point 8:23 10:14 11:21,24	privilege 4:6
<b>passes</b> 51:13	15:5,25 18:17 22:19 23:4 29:9	privileged 4:10
passion 38:12	38:24 41:23 42:14,24 44:21 45:20 48:4 49:9 50:7	probably 25:8,18
passionate 41:12	poke 37:13	<b>problem</b> 27:13,14,17 36:2
<b>PASTULA</b> 3:24 20:18 21:23 37:17,20 40:16 44:13,25 45:7	polarized 6:25	problematic 16:1
46:2,23 50:16,20,24	•	process 6:11 7:16 29:5 49:
path 5:14 14:4,14	<b>political</b> 23:1 32:8 34:24,25 36:22	<b>Promote</b> 17:24 18:4
<b>paths</b> 12:10	politicians 39:18 40:1	prompt 3:11
<b>eople</b> 12:4,5,10,15,18 17:23	population 7:3 28:11 29:11	proposed 22:4,6,7
19:15 20:1 21:3,25 29:10,19, 25 31:5,22 32:19 35:13 36:7	30:5 36:6	protect 34:19 49:13
38:11 40:3,6,8 43:7,11,12,13,	<b>position</b> 39:21 40:1	protected 5:23 49:22 50:1
14,16 44:3,5,11 49:14	possible 24:15 39:10 47:8	protects 49:14

people's 46:9

potential 31:2 42:3

prove 24:11 34:17

**provide** 4:11,25 5:14,22 6:13, rather 7:5 14:5 35:12 related 46:20 47:1,2,3,10 48:3 14 10:1 36:10 50:16 rationales 42:18 provides 11:17 relatively 29:11 re-join 51:14 providing 33:13 **relied** 11:15 reaching 24:5 **public** 2:7 13:2 15:19,20 reluctance 7:20 read 7:6 34:19 16:17 21:25 22:10 37:11 41:12 remedy 7:1 49:12 real 45:6 remember 9:3,7 10:5 12:11 pull 32:14 44:19 reality 8:25 16:5 17:2 23:20 28:25 29:24 37:24 purpose 46:2 realize 9:18 23:5 46:11 47:5 pursuant 6:23 really 6:19 11:22 16:2 22:20 remind 50:5,12 23:17 24:6 30:2 31:13 35:22, put 10:16 12:17 21:19 30:11 remotely 2:11,12,17,24 3:13 25 37:1,13 39:24 40:16 41:1,3, 35:20 51:12 5 42:25 47:22 48:15 putting 14:25 17:12 34:4 removed 25:20 reason 7:22 8:2 12:7 31:15 33:1 47:3 repeat 33:14 Q reasonably 19:24 report 10:21 11:8 reasons 12:7 17:12 41:24 **reporter** 19:7,10 question 9:23 15:5 17:6 28:1 35:15 36:12 37:16 46:20 47:1 Rebecca 3:6 **require** 5:18,20 10:5 17:13 41:25 42:1 question/answer 36:13 recall 6:21 required 6:7,23 7:3 questions 5:3,14 6:16,18 received 3:21 4:19 41:4,6 44:20 requirement 23:14 48:10 recent 30:4 33:23,25 quick 23:8 40:17 49:3 requirements 17:18 recently 11:21 12:1 quickly 47:8 **requires** 5:15 6:2 10:22 recognize 22:13 quite 15:20 resolution 4:5 recollection 28:14 resolve 27:22 recommended 7:10 20:10 R resources 38:23 46:7 record 2:7 4:1 6:13 12:17 race 5:24 6:4 12:12 13:24 30:11 31:3 42:4,8,22 respect 34:18 38:11,12 40:12 14:5,9 16:5 20:18 21:1 29:3,4 recording 51:3 response 47:19 34:4,6,16 47:25 48:11 49:14, redistricting 2:6 7:14 12:13 responsive 29:22 24:21 35:3 race-based 7:20,21 result 5:11 22:25 34:14 referenced 11:7 races 15:1 resulted 22:4 23:3 referencing 32:1 racial 6:22,25 10:16 13:19 results 6:10 8:3,9,10,12,20, **reflected** 27:7 37:2 21,24 9:1,2 34:10 racially 6:25 regard 4:12 49:8 retrogression 38:10 raise 51:19,21 regardless 47:24 return 5:2 51:1 raised 51:23 regards 49:5 returned 4:20 random 9:7 30:5 Reinhardt 3:19 reunification 28:9 randomly 31:6 **REINHART** 26:10,14 50:11 reunifying 14:25 range 18:3 REINHRT 51:11 revealing 17:22 **Rapids** 45:20

review 35:8

rhetoric 14:23

rhetorical 9:23

Rhonda 2:22 26:25 51:24,25

Richard 3:14

**right** 8:11 18:10 25:4 26:8 27:4 28:2 31:10 32:10,13 33:7 35:15 46:4,5,13 51:15,18 52:4

right-hand 25:12

rights 4:7,12,23 5:15,17,21 6:24 7:12 8:5 9:8,19 10:5,21 11:3 15:21,22 16:3,4,12,18 17:1,13 18:14 19:8 20:4 29:1, 17 31:8,19,21 33:3 36:14,15, 19,20 42:21 47:10,18 48:1,3, 12,18,24 49:12,13,19,21 50:2

ripped 40:9,10

rockets 12:14

roll 2:8,11

**room** 4:19 20:22 41:11 45:12 50:19

**Rothhorn** 3:4,5 8:7,11,17 25:22 26:1 46:17,25 51:23

rules 4:16.21

run 21:3 31:3

running 21:8,9 50:12

runs 34:24

S

Saginaw 15:7

**said** 5:7 12:20 17:3,7,8,23 18:22 19:10 23:22 27:7 29:14 33:10 36:8 37:1,11,22 39:8 42:5,14 43:8 47:18,23 49:25

**same** 9:10 10:14,23 16:10 18:7,15 23:16 24:8 40:15 41:21 43:15,18 51:16

Sarah 24:23

**saw** 39:17 49:11

**say** 2:9 9:6 12:3 15:1,13 16:4 19:8,22,23,24 21:18 22:8,13, 21 25:6 26:20 28:15 30:17 33:4,11 37:5 38:9 41:10 42:9

43:6,8 46:10,21 48:16 51:19, 21

**saying** 9:7 14:23 15:8 19:20 20:16 22:15 26:22 32:15 33:2, 5,7,8 39:19 40:1,13 41:15,17, 22 45:12,13

**says** 6:15 33:19,25 34:3 35:1 38:9,10 39:23 42:8 48:12,24

**scares** 39:24

scent 20:7

**school** 20:25

screen 24:14,17,22 27:2

se 16:18

**second** 8:13 35:16 45:20 46:20 47:1 51:7

seconded 51:9

Secondly 33:22

**secretary** 2:7,8,9,15,18,20, 22,25 3:2,4,6,8,10,14,16,18

**Section** 4:2,13 17:1 23:14 24:11 31:18 33:10,11 34:7 38:8

**secure** 38:22

security 33:13

**see** 23:21 24:16 25:10,11 26:3, 8,16,24 31:1,24 33:11 39:25 42:10 49:23 51:22

**seeing** 26:18

seen 6:4 10:17 23:2 47:22

**Selma** 47:19

senate 18:7,8,9

**sense** 6:13 9:20 14:7 28:11 29:6 31:3 48:16

separate 23:5 42:19

separated 21:20

September 6:21

seriously 30:11

**served** 14:10

**session** 2:5 3:20 4:1,2,3,5,17, 22,24 5:1,2,4 12:8 38:20 40:18,24 41:8 45:3 46:3,18,24 47:9 51:6,10,19 52:5

sessions 4:16 25:1

set 6:13 8:13 50:6

settings 26:12

seven 9:6,11

several 7:19

shared 4:18

**she** 7:3 23:22 24:24 47:11,12

**she's** 21:16 **shed** 23:21

**shifts** 34:16

shocked 19:10

**should** 17:8 22:9 25:3,4,16 26:14 34:21 38:22 46:21 50:19

shouldn't 10:15

**show** 19:11 23:15 24:10 30:3, 5,11 31:4 33:21

**showed** 26:18

**showing** 9:22 26:25 27:1 30:12

**shows** 17:7 23:23 30:23 37:6

**shut** 50:7

**side-by-side** 25:7,17

**signed** 49:18

significant 32:16 48:19

significantly 30:22

since 12:18 32:2 48:22

**sit** 40:14 45:21

situations 22:23

**six** 9:11

**smoke** 35:5

**so** 3:24,25 4:21 5:4 6:11 7:21 8:7,18,22 9:14,21 10:1,12 11:14,20 12:21 13:11,24 14:12,16,18,24 15:4,5 16:23 17:11,21,24 18:3,11,12,16 19:17 21:5,17 23:24 24:6 25:20 26:3,8 27:9,11,16,18,19, 21 28:5 29:5,15,22 31:9,19,24 32:4,12 33:4,12,19 34:2,9,11 35:21 36:2,11 38:4,16 39:3 40:6,12 41:6,8,14,17,21 43:5, 19 44:2,8,11,13,18 45:23,24

2021	Index: socialtakeaway
standpoint 28:11 48:7	substantial 12:16 31:3
<b>start</b> 3:24,25 5:16 40:14	subtracting 12:4,5
<b>started</b> 33:10 50:25	<b>success</b> 5:25 6:2 48:12
<b>state</b> 4:8 32:2,17 33:22 36:7,8	succinct 39:9
43:10	<b>such</b> 39:22
<b>stated</b> 33:20 49:19	<b>Sue</b> 4:20 51:1
statement 35:17	<b>sued</b> 45:23,24 49:15
statements 17:23	suffer 44:11
<b>States</b> 48:21 49:15,17	suggested 7:7
statewide 8:24 9:1	suggesting 21:10 28:13
stating 3:25	32:13
statistics 18:1,8	suggestion 28:22
<b>statute</b> 5:23 33:15,16,18 34:8,	suggestions 11:25 14:4
	<b>support</b> 11:19 23:16,18 24:4
-	38:21
	<b>supported</b> 11:10 23:24 40:22, 23
•	supporting 24:8
• •	supports 28:4
	supposed 34:19
<b>stick</b> 8:2 43:23,24	<b>Supreme</b> 6:23 7:19 9:9 17:2
<b>still</b> 15:10 25:14 27:1 40:11	23:13 34:3
	sure 8:7,23 19:21 45:3,16
	46:25
_	sweat 44:9
_	system 32:5
	<b>Szetela</b> 2:4 3:6,19 14:17,21
	15:16 17:21 21:15 23:10 24:12,18,23 25:3,11,16,21,23,
	25 26:6,21 27:4,23 32:19,22
	35:24 36:1,11,17,22 39:2,5 42:10 43:3 46:16,22 49:1 50:3,
_	13 51:8,25 52:4
	Szetele 3:7
<b>strongly</b> 14:6 16:25 46:8	<b>0_01010</b> 0
strongly 14:6 16:25 46:8 stuck 43:17	
<b>stuck</b> 43:17	Т
	start 3:24,25 5:16 40:14  started 33:10 50:25  state 4:8 32:2,17 33:22 36:7,8     43:10  stated 33:20 49:19  statement 35:17  statements 17:23  States 48:21 49:15,17  statewide 8:24 9:1  stating 3:25  statistics 18:1,8  statute 5:23 33:15,16,18 34:8, 9 49:23  stay 26:4 32:15 50:19  staying 46:5  step 15:21  stepped 20:22  Steve 2:25 37:1 43:24  stick 8:2 43:23,24  still 15:10 25:14 27:1 40:11     43:9  stone 18:24  straight 6:13  strange 24:19  strategizing 40:17 45:3,6  strategy 42:6  stress 6:19 12:2 13:6 31:14     42:25  stressing 6:8  strive 43:12

**stage** 13:3 30:21 48:15

**spot** 22:17

subsection 4:15

substance 40:20 41:1

takeaway 18:13

takeaways 14:12

taken 38:3

takes 31:2

taking 30:10 39:25

**talk** 5:5 9:2 21:12 32:4 35:13 46:18

**talked** 7:15 11:20 12:11 14:4, 13 21:1 32:7 42:16

**talking** 7:6 16:1,2 17:1 19:6 21:19,24,25 27:21 28:12 29:12 38:20 40:8 41:9 45:5

talks 11:16 33:15,16

tap 46:7

television 47:21

**tell** 10:4 20:12 28:9 35:1 36:3 43:17

telling 17:9

tells 24:2

ten 7:14,18 37:4

terminology 41:16

terms 43:8

testimony 22:1 30:1

**than** 7:5,17 12:24 14:5 18:12 20:2 21:8 29:7 37:7 48:8

Thanedar 23:20

**thank** 3:19,24 5:9 8:22 27:2 43:4 45:7 46:1 48:25 51:17

that 2:11 3:21 4:1,11,16,20,21, 23 5:2,7,11,16 6:1,2,6,8,11,15 7:1,3,7,8,9,10,15,22,25 8:6,8, 17,18 9:4,5,7,14,22,25 10:1,2, 6,10,12,14,15,17,21,24 11:4,7, 8,11,18,19,21,22,23,24 12:1,7, 8,14,15,16,21,24 13:1,5,11,13, 14,15,17,24 14:2,5,9,13,15,18, 23 15:1,2,4,5,8,9,10,12,19,20, 25 16:2,5,7,8,9,10,14,15,20, 21,24,25 17:3,8,9,21,23 18:2, 14,20,22 19:1,8,14,17,19,20, 21,22 20:6,10,11,12,15,19,25 21:3,9,11,20,25 22:2,3,14,15, 17,18,19,21,22 23:2,5,15,16, 21,23,25 24:4,6,10,14,24 25:5, 11 27:8,11,13,15,17,18,19,20, 22 28:2,4,5,6,7,8,10,12,14,16, 19,20,22,25 29:3,5,6,8,12,13, 14,15,17,18,20,23 30:3,5,11,

12,15,17,18,19,21 31:1,2,7,11, 12,13,14,19,20,24 32:1,6,7,8, 9,12,14,15 33:1,5,8,12,14,15, 16,19 34:4,5,6,7,11,14,16,17 35:3,7,8,12,13,15,22,24 36:7, 9,17 37:2,6,9,11,16,22 38:3,6, 17,20,23,25 39:18,19,20,22, 23,24 40:3,4,6,8,9,10,11,15 41:1,3,4,6,8,20,23,24 42:2,3,4, 6,8,14,17,18,19,22,23,24 43:6, 7,13,14,17,21,24,25 44:6,17, 25 45:13,15,24,25 46:7,21 47:4,5,9,13,20,21 48:10,14,16, 17,19,20,22,25 49:7,10,19,25 50:1,5,6,8,12 51:15,17

that's 5:12,24 7:3,5 8:1 9:16 10:8,9,16,24 11:10,14,17 13:5 14:3,12 15:12,14,24 16:17,22, 23 17:9,11 18:6,17 19:22,24 20:3,7,13,16 21:8,10 22:20 23:1,7 24:6,9 26:19 27:2 28:1, 23 29:23 30:13,20 31:11,13, 21,22 34:13 35:12,14,19 36:5, 20 39:9 41:21,22 42:21 44:18 46:22 47:8,16 48:1,12,20,22, 23,24 49:9 51:3,4

**their** 17:25 18:5,7,8,9,11,15,20 21:7 36:20 37:7,8 38:11,12 40:7 42:18 44:4 45:4

**them** 13:19 27:15,19 30:10 35:9,25 36:1 37:10 40:5 42:20 48:14 51:1,22

**then** 9:22 15:1 18:6 24:11 26:15 27:1,5,20,24 32:23 33:7 34:15,16 36:6,23 41:17 45:8 48:22 49:1

there 5:25 6:1,11,12,16,24,25 8:25 9:5 10:16 11:8,14 12:10 13:4,11 16:5,6,14 17:3,10 18:24 19:5,7 20:25 22:22 23:17 24:14,15,24 25:2 26:14, 15,24 28:14,17 30:13 31:7,20, 23 32:15 33:14,16 35:21 36:8 37:3,25 38:1,2 40:3,6 42:2 44:19 45:21 47:3 49:15,19,24

**there's** 9:1 12:16 23:16,18,23 24:3 25:5 37:15

therefore 4:13

**these** 4:10 5:3 6:20 10:12,25 11:9,23 13:7,9 15:2,20,24 16:25 17:3,23 18:23 19:3 22:3

23:6,17 24:6 28:13,19 29:10, 21,24 30:10,19 40:10 42:6,12 45:21 50:9

they 7:7,20,23 8:12 9:22 10:2, 3,21 11:9 13:19 15:25 17:5,6 18:5,19,20 19:5 20:2 21:10 22:5,15,16 23:15 24:4 27:10, 13,14 28:5,15 29:15 33:23,25 34:2 35:20 36:6 37:4,8 39:18, 19 41:12,13,15 42:13,16,18 43:7,8,13,16 44:3,6,9 49:22

**they're** 9:17 10:3 12:15 13:8 15:22 17:6 18:3,23 19:6 24:9 38:13 41:12,16,17

**thing** 18:7 20:21 21:12,22 24:2 26:8 34:9 35:6 43:23 44:7,18 45:13 49:3

**things** 5:4 11:23 12:2,11 15:19 17:22 22:3 42:6 43:9 44:16,17 45:10

think 7:24 11:7 13:5,11 14:3, 13,22 15:3,5 16:15,20,23 17:9 18:24 21:3 22:5,6,13,19,20 23:4,6 26:23 28:1,2,6,8,22 29:13,19,23 30:20 31:10,11 32:9 34:2 35:12 37:15,20 38:6, 16,18,21 39:16,23 41:23,24 45:22 47:4 49:5,10,24 50:7

**thinking** 7:16 15:13 40:15 48:13

this 2:5 4:19,24 5:4,10 6:10 7:13,25 8:8 9:4 11:20,22 12:8, 20 16:12,15 17:11 19:22 20:2, 17 21:19 22:11,22 24:7,14 25:7 26:8 29:1,25 30:12,14,21 31:4,14,15,18 32:17 33:23 36:12 37:12 38:20,24 41:11 42:3,7,25 43:5,22,23 45:12,22 46:11 47:23 49:12 50:6,7,19, 20,24 51:13,14,16

**Thornburg** 9:8 23:12

**those** 8:22 16:14 20:19 38:21, 23 43:10,21 44:16 45:13 46:23

**thought** 5:10 6:19 8:1 17:22 21:11 31:7,19 43:5

**thoughts** 11:25 21:16 45:4 46:17

three 23:24 29:7 32:19

threshold 6:20 10:9

thresholds 16:14 17:3,5

through 15:23 22:7

ties 6:8

time 5:2 23:1,2 31:14 32:5

42:4,7

times 20:22 33:12

tired 24:14

today 6:21 33:12 42:19 50:19

today's 2:10

**together** 12:17 13:18,25 14:1, 8 15:1 21:20 23:15 24:9 42:13

toggle 25:5

told 41:2 43:24

**Tomorrow** 36:10,11

took 32:8

tools 46:6

top 12:15 35:13

topic 4:22,24 40:24 49:4

**topics** 4:18

touched 9:4

track 31:10 32:10 38:15 46:4,5

tragedies 14:2

train 43:5

tremendous 31:1

trial 13:8

tried 33:22 37:13

true 11:23 12:24 23:1 28:8

39:20 40:9,10

try 38:15 43:21

trying 24:20 25:7 26:20

turn 5:8

turnout 46:19,20

**two** 4:23 5:3 16:15 18:2 22:25 33:20 38:1 39:9 45:10 46:17

type 20:16 31:21

types 44:16

typically 6:4 36:14

U

**U.S.** 48:2

unanimous 52:5

uncertainties 6:17

uncomfortable 37:10 39:14

**under** 4:13 5:23 7:24 23:12 31:18 33:10 34:2 46:11 49:22

50:1

understand 8:8 13:22 39:17

understanding 42:8,9,12

47:12

understands 17:18

understood 15:13

undertone 39:19

undertones 15:9

unfolded 7:17

unfortunately 26:10

unique 22:22

uniquely 15:3

United 48:21 49:15,17

unknown 38:4

unless 51:2

**unlike** 19:4,14

**unmute** 3:11

unpacking 32:6,16

unpopular 38:14

until 12:21 13:9 32:2 38:3

**up** 12:1,14 13:9 19:6 20:20

23:9,11 25:5 27:20 29:15 30:15,22 31:6,16 32:20 35:9 39:7,18 40:9,10,13 43:19,20,

21 44:2,7 45:11 48:14 50:6

update 47:8

upfront 35:16

**upholds** 15:10

upon 4:4 11:16

**upper** 25:4,12,13

**us** 6:17 14:2,8 21:2 24:1,2 26:6

33:19 34:17 35:21 36:3 39:25 40:14 41:16 47:2 49:7,11 50:5

**use** 10:15 12:3 14:23 18:19 19:23 35:3,19,21 43:7 51:16

used 12:14 17:7

useful 10:1 13:11 24:1

using 15:4 21:9 41:15,19

50:10

**usually** 24:25

٧

**Vallette** 3:8,9,12

valuable 23:25

**VAP** 7:2 15:24 16:20 17:8

18:23 28:6

various 17:2 23:18

varying 23:24 24:4

vast 20:11 28:12,13

veers 4:24

verbally 52:1

versus 9:9 23:13

very 9:13,24 13:23 16:23,24 19:15 20:7 21:8 23:7 24:1

30:20 33:24 37:8,10,25 41:12

**vibe** 20:16

vibrant 42:4

view 19:3 25:6 26:15

violating 16:25

violations 15:21,22 49:19

violence 47:21

Virginia 33:22

**vote** 9:10 17:25 18:4 23:14,15 31:7 32:10 51:11,13 52:1

voted 13:21 35:1

voter 23:22 24:3 46:19

**voters** 7:11 9:20,21 10:10 11:9 22:24 23:15,23

**voting** 4:7,9,12,22 5:15,17,21 6:22,23,24,25 7:2,12 8:4 9:8, 19 10:5,17,21 15:21,22 16:3,4,

12,17 17:1,13 18:14 19:7 20:3 24:9 29:1,11,17 31:8,18,21 36:14,20 42:21 46:19 47:10,18 48:1,3,12,18,23 49:12,13,19, 21 50:2

VRA 5:5,7 6:1 7:24 17:11,17 20:13 21:5,22 22:15 29:20 34:2,7 40:22,23 41:2,5,9,10,25 42:8,15,17 44:15,20 45:14 46:3 47:1,3,13 48:21 49:5 50:10.17

**VRAS** 43:23

## W

Wagner 3:10 27:1 52:3

**wait** 47:4

wall 35:11

want 8:7 12:9 13:12,14,15,19 14:8 15:10,17 16:11 19:21 22:12 23:8 24:13 25:8,18 26:8, 19 27:10 28:15 29:10 32:18 34:25 39:9 40:6,14,16 41:12, 13,16 42:24 44:3 46:10 49:10 51:12

wanted 6:12 8:4,22 12:7 13:6 20:21,23 31:13 37:15 39:7 41:7,25 42:14,25 43:6 47:15 48:4,20 50:5

wants 3:23

warning 4:25 44:14

warranted 37:8

was 4:3,5 5:11 6:19 7:18 11:7 12:24 13:4,24,25 16:20 17:22 19:10 20:12,23,24 21:3,5,6,11, 18 22:15 25:1 27:8,14,15,21 31:7 32:4,16 33:4 34:20 35:2, 9,10,17 36:17 37:10,14 38:3 41:3,4 43:24 46:3,20 47:1,19, 21,22 48:13,14,18 49:15,24 50:6

wasn't 21:5 46:25

water 20:24 43:9,13 44:7

**way** 11:17 15:10,25 19:19 22:20,21 24:15,24 27:18 28:25 32:13 43:13,25

ways 40:15,24

we'll 19:23 47:11 51:4

we're 5:5 12:5 14:24,25 15:2,4 16:1,2 19:13,16,20,21,25 21:19 25:1 28:12 29:12,16 30:7,8,10 31:10 33:13 35:20 36:5 38:20 39:15,23 40:2,17, 18,19,21 41:8,21 42:5 43:22 44:14,15 45:14,17,18,19,25

**we've** 6:8 7:10,16 8:5 9:4 10:13,17,25 11:20 14:4,13 27:12 34:14 37:20 38:7,24 39:15,22 43:20 44:1,3,19 47:2 49:6

wealth 38:18

webinar 51:15

Wednesday 2:1 4:4

weed 22:17

week 14:16

weeks 20:9 29:7

weighing 36:19

Weiss 3:14,15

well 8:14 9:23 17:2,7 21:12 22:12 30:23 31:11,15 33:10,25 34:1 36:25 38:21 39:7,13 42:22 45:4,22 47:17 49:9

well-done 37:14

went 13:3 34:3 37:12

were 12:22 13:1,2,11,19 15:14 16:7,8 18:3,18 20:25 21:10,23, 24,25 22:1,2,5,15 27:9,13,14 28:3,14,15,16 29:7 30:13,18, 24 31:18 32:3 34:2,4 37:4,7,24 39:18,19 41:1,4 42:20 45:9 46:4,18 49:19,25 51:15

what 5:15 6:8,14 7:1,20 10:8, 18,25 11:15,16 12:10,20,22, 23,24 13:4,5,14 14:22,24 15:1, 10,12,13,14 17:12,18 18:3 19:6,11,16 20:3,12,23 21:5,6, 10 22:9 23:22 26:19,21 29:14 30:12,13,23,24 31:4,22,24 32:18 33:2,3,5,11 34:11,22 35:7,14,19,21 36:3,8 38:4,8, 12,22 39:8,11,15 40:1,12,19, 21,22 41:1,9,10,12,13,14,16, 17,21,25 42:1,8 43:14,17 44:3 46:3 48:12,23 50:15 51:13

**what's** 7:8 8:14 9:3 14:2 17:3 20:8 23:19 28:8 29:24 36:6,8

**whatever** 7:23 30:22 35:4,6 43:18

when 2:10 9:17 12:13 13:3 14:24 15:3,5 18:15 19:10,14 21:19,23,24 25:1 27:8 33:19 35:1 36:2 43:6,16 45:13,21 47:12,13

**where** 6:20 16:19,22 22:24 23:6 29:10 34:7 42:19 47:12

**whether** 15:7 19:18 28:8,10, 15 29:19 32:4 40:23

**which** 14:6 28:21 34:20 37:8 40:11 42:18 48:3

**while** 6:9 7:15 10:1 11:20 22:15 49:11,25

white 9:6 12:5

Whitmer 23:20

**who** 3:23 12:20 13:20 14:10 17:18,19 19:4,15 32:19 33:3,7 34:25 35:6,8,14,16 37:3 39:18

who's 9:23

**whole** 10:4 13:18 16:11,16,17 19:24

**whom** 35:1

**why** 7:7,22 8:2 15:22 17:6 26:4 33:10 36:18 39:19 41:24 43:22 51:3,4

will-o-the-wisp 35:5

win 40:7

wind 29:15

wins 11:5 29:4

within 18:2 22:25

without 14:19 22:7 30:4 41:13

Toll Free: 844.730.4066

Witjes 3:16,17 51:7,9

woefully 11:13

won't 22:8

wonder 18:20

wondering 18:18

word 10:15 41:19

wording 46:11

TRANSCRIPTION, AUDIO 10/27/2021 Index: words..Zoom words 39:9 **Zoom** 51:14 work 19:17 22:4 32:5,9,16 40:25 43:12 44:10 48:21,22 50:6,10 working 22:25 worried 21:16 worries 17:24 would 9:13,24 16:1,20,21 17:21 26:23 27:18 28:22 31:19 39:16 46:8 50:11 wreath 35:5 **writing** 48:13 **written** 18:24 wrong 33:20 37:5 41:15,19 Υ **yeah** 8:18 23:10 24:25 25:3,7, 8,13 36:22 37:4,19 39:13 41:18 42:24 43:15 46:22 50:14 years 7:14,18 37:4 39:17 48:8 49:16 yes 8:6,15,16 14:16 16:19,20 18:17 20:6 21:14 24:13 32:12 35:10 36:12 yesterday 13:17 14:12 yet 7:22 8:1 21:13 25:25 26:1, you'd 41:6 **you'll** 26:15 you're 2:10 12:10,18 19:16 20:3 26:11,21 28:2 29:6 30:11 32:18 40:12 41:18 45:23,24 46:5 you've 14:15 16:14 your 2:10 3:11 8:23 13:9 15:25 18:12 19:4,17 22:4 23:4 26:11, 12 27:9 29:18 30:2 31:24 32:15 36:3 40:25 42:4 44:14 45:3 46:8 48:6 50:25 51:19,21 52:1 Ζ

zero 38:2

Toll Free: 844.730.4066